

hope of disposing of the Lake Erie and Ohio River Canal bill this evening, I ask unanimous consent that it may be taken up to-morrow morning after the routine morning business shall have been completed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. BACON. What is the request, Mr. President?

Mr. PENROSE. To take up the Lake Erie and Ohio River Canal bill to-morrow morning.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The request is that the Lake Erie and Ohio River Canal bill, which has been under consideration, shall be taken up for consideration immediately after the routine morning business to-morrow. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and that order is made.

AIDS TO NAVIGATION.

Mr. NELSON submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 19432) to authorize additional aids to navigation in the Light-House Establishment, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 7, 9, 10, 16, 17, 18.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 15, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In the first line of the language proposed strike out the word "light-ship" and insert in lieu thereof the words "light vessel;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In next to the last line of the language proposed strike out the words "to construct" and insert in lieu thereof the words "toward constructing;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language proposed insert the following: "Range lights, Superior pierhead, Lake Superior, Wisconsin, at a cost not to exceed twenty thousand dollars;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language proposed insert the following: "A light and fog-signal station, Hinchinbrook entrance, Prince William Sound, Alaska, at a cost not to exceed one hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars;" and the Senate agree to the same.

KNUTE NELSON,
J. H. GALLINGER,
THOMAS S. MARTIN,

Conferees on the part of the Senate.

JAMES R. MANN,
F. C. STEVENS,
W. C. ADAMSON,

Conferees on the part of the House.

Mr. HALE. I rise to a privileged motion.

Mr. NELSON. I ask that the conference report may be printed and lie on the table, to be taken up to-morrow.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The order to print will be made, in the absence of objection.

Mr. HALE. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, June 14, 1906, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, June 13, 1906.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Lands have permission to sit during the sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR BILL.

Mr. COUSINS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill H. R. 19264, the diplomatic and consular bill, and ask unanimous consent that the House nonconcur in the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COUSINS] asks unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 19264 shall be taken from the Speaker's table and that the House nonconcur in the Senate amendments and ask for a conference. The Clerk will read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 19264. An act making appropriation for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER announced the following conferees: Mr. COUSINS, Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS, and Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the question of the transportation and distribution of manufactured and agricultural products is the most important subject that at present or hereafter can engage the attention of the lawmaker or the political economist. Upon the correct solution of this problem depends very largely the future greatness and prosperity of this country. Every article manufactured or produced must be transported to market by some means. The question may be well divided into three classes and treated under as many different heads: (1) Transportation by rail; (2) transportation by water; (3) transportation over the common highways or dirt roads.

I need not discuss the first proposition, as many days and weeks have been consumed in the debate on the bill now in the hands of the conferees, and which will doubtless become a law in its most essential features, and which is intended to regulate interstate commerce by rail and to fix and enforce just and reasonable rates. Every phase of the subject has been presented and discussed by able and experienced lawmakers, and to my mind the question of transportation by rail is settled so far as Congress can do it. Further discussion is therefore unnecessary until different conditions demand it.

The question of transportation and distribution by water is so different from that of rail transportation that an entirely different remedy must be applied. No country on the face of the earth is so blessed with navigable rivers and lakes as ours. They are nature's highways of commerce, which we are to use in making our country great. But if we are to get the full benefit of these noble streams they must be improved, the harbors deepened, and canals constructed wherever necessary to complete a system of continuous and uninterrupted navigation. They all flow to the sea, and across the sea are our foreign markets, which we must reach at the lowest possible cost if we expect to meet and undersell our competitors. We are constructing, at a very great cost, the Panama Canal, connecting the two oceans. If our rivers are not improved and our harbors deepened, over and through which our commerce must of necessity reach the canal, we will have lost to a great extent the benefits to be derived from the expenditure of the \$200,000,000 required to construct the Panama Canal. We can not reach this canal by rail. We must go by water if at all.

Mr. Speaker, in my own State of Alabama there are nearly 2,000 miles of surveyed and approved rivers, some of which are being improved, but the progress is very slow on account of the inadequate appropriations made by Congress. Some of the most important of these rivers are being neglected and flowing idly to the sea. All of them reach the Gulf of Mexico through the harbor at Mobile, the Tennessee alone excepted. This harbor is the nearest port of importance to the eastern terminus of the Panama Canal. The rivers of Alabama traverse the entire State and flow through the great iron and coal deposits, virgin forests of timber, rich agricultural lands, and inexhaustible beds of cement rock. We demand that all these splendid arteries of commerce be improved so that every day navigation to the Gulf will be secured, and that the channel at Mobile be deepened to at least 27 feet and over the outer bar to 35 feet. When this work is completed and the Panama Canal is opened to commercial use the largest coaling station in the world will be located in Alabama, near Fort Morgan, and the splendid anchorage inside the bar is sufficiently deep and large to hold all the ships that pass through the canal, where all will fill their bunkers with Alabama coal, at a cost not to exceed \$1.50 per ton.

In order to show the benefits of an increased export and import trade which have followed the improvement of the harbor at Mobile, I desire to submit certain figures that will settle forever the question of returns for the money expended in improving the harbor at that place and the rivers which flow into it. During the year 1885 4 steamships and 286 sailing ves-

sels entered that port. During the first eleven months in 1905 1,320 steamships and 488 sailing vessels entered the harbor. As late as 1894 the exports for the year were \$2,823,690; the imports were \$652,113. In the first eleven months of 1905 the exports were \$18,407,214; the imports were \$4,250,915. This is foreign trade alone. In 1884 43,830 bales of cotton were exported. In the first eleven months of 1905 180,708 bales of cotton left the port of Mobile for foreign markets. These figures show an increase of over 30,000 per cent since the active work of improving that harbor and the rivers began. I am indebted to Hon. R. H. Clarke, of Mobile, for these figures. Mr. Clarke was a Member of this House for ten years, and served on the Rivers and Harbors Committee.

Mr. Speaker, God has placed at our disposal and for our use the best and surest means for regulating railroad traffic and preventing unjust and unreasonable rates. The rivers belong to the people, and can not be combined or organized into a trust or corporation of unjust discrimination. They are free to every citizen who desires to use them. As a competitor the railroads must meet the much smaller cost of water transportation. The improvement of the rivers in Alabama and other States in the Union will reduce railroad rates at every point to a minimum cost of transportation. For illustration, about three years ago, when the river and harbor bill was being considered by the committee, Mr. Jones, of Pittsburg, of the firm of Jones & Laughlin, of that city, was before us. His firm is one of the biggest manufacturing industries of the United States. He stated that when navigation was good on the Monongahela River the freight charges on coal to his factory were at the phenomenally low rate of 3½ to 4 cents per ton by barge, but when an accident happened to any of the locks on the river, whenever a freeze came and navigation was stopped, the railroads immediately advanced the charges to 44 cents per ton, or over eleven times as much as the river rates were. This would apply in Alabama, with our rivers opened to navigation, the same as in Pennsylvania. The Monongahela River is not so large as the Coosa and no larger than the Warrior River in Alabama, and neither of these streams ever freeze over.

A few million dollars expended under the continuing-contract system would add many millions to the wealth of the State and save many more millions to producers and consumers. River transportation is the safety valve for unjust and extortionate railroad charges. We are to spend \$200,000,000 on the Panama Canal, all of which will be virtually wasted, so far as Alabama and the Southern States are concerned, unless we improve our rivers and harbors and construct necessary canals, so that we may supply the great demands which will be made upon us for the products of our coal, iron, and ore mines, our cement deposits and valuable timber forests, our cotton and other farm products, which will thus be brought so cheaply within reach of the markets of the world. Pittsburg is now demanding \$40,000,000 in order that she may have improved water transportation to the Gulf of Mexico by New Orleans. Chicago is clamoring for \$60,000,000 so as to connect the Great Lakes with the Gulf. Every section of the country is looking to the completion of the canal and seeking the cheapest means of transportation to it. The producer who reaches the consumer by the cheapest methods of transportation will always find a profitable market. The cost of transportation and the facilities given to it are the greatest factors in our future greatness both as a commercial and agricultural people.

The last Congress appropriated .64 per cent of our revenues for preparation for and reparation of war, and 4 per cent to improve the rivers and harbors of the country to facilitate the transportation of our vast and rapidly increasing commerce. The State of Alabama, which I, in part, represent, is one of the richest States in the Union in natural resources. Her vast iron and coal deposits are being rapidly developed, her cotton fields are being cultivated to their utmost capacity, her timber is being marketed at profitable prices, and nothing stands in the way of her soon becoming the rival of any State unless it be the means of cheap transportation. If our rivers were improved, our products would go south of us to the markets of the world and thereby relieve the home market of the sharp competition now existing. The day is fast approaching when we must rely upon foreign markets in which to dispose of our surplus product, or else competition at home will make business unprofitable. The Birmingham district alone produced last year 37,000,000 tons of freight—more than the great ports of London and Liverpool combined. All this vast commerce is moved by rail, at an average cost of three-fourths of a cent per ton per mile. The average water rate the country over is one-fifth of a cent per ton per mile. If the projected canal from Birmingham to the Warrior River, which has been surveyed and pronounced feasible, had been completed, and the Warrior and Bigbee rivers

improved, the saving would have been enough in two years to have paid for the construction of the canal and the improvement of the rivers. These improvements must come. Our growing commerce demands it. The world's markets can not be reached without it.

The cost of transporting a ton of coal by water from Pittsburg to New Orleans, a distance of 2,000 miles, is 70 cents per ton, and when the contemplated improvements are completed it is estimated that the cost will be reduced to 50 cents per ton. The cost of transporting a ton of coal from the Birmingham district to New Orleans by rail, a distance of 448 miles, is \$1.50 per ton. The rate from the Birmingham district to Mobile by rail, a distance of 247 miles, is \$1.25 per ton. The rate from the Birmingham district by water, by way of the Warrior and Bigbee rivers, is estimated at 30 cents per ton. The cost of transportation over the Coosa and Alabama rivers will be less than over the Warrior and the Bigbee, because the former rivers are wider and will enable a larger number of barges to be towed at one time and consequently a greater number of tons. It is known that the greater number of tons a tow carries the cheaper the rate per ton, and it is estimated that coal could be delivered for domestic and export purposes over the Coosa and the Alabama rivers at not exceeding 25 cents per ton. When the improvement on the Tennessee River at Colbert Shoals is completed and the minor obstructions between that point and Chattanooga are removed it will open a waterway to the Mississippi at Cairo and give continual water connection with all the markets on the great Mississippi River and its tributaries, including St. Louis, Cincinnati, Louisville, and Pittsburg. When the Chicago Ship Canal is completed, which the enterprising people of that wonderful city are now so vigorously pressing before Congress, all of the ports on the Great Lakes, including Duluth, Detroit, Cleveland, Buffalo, and through the Erie Canal the great city of New York, will be connected by a continuous waterway to Chattanooga, Tenn.

The human mind can not conceive the wonderful benefits these waterways when completed will bring to the people of the Southern States. Our natural resources are almost inexhaustible, and when we consider that the value of the cotton crop in the Southern States for the last five years exceeds the entire production of gold and silver in the world by more than \$400,000,000 we are forced to the conclusion that the day is rapidly approaching when the South will be the most prosperous section of the country.

It is only through a system of improved waterways that the great, cheap, and heavy products of the mine, forests, and fields are profitably brought to tidewater and thence to the world's markets. With this knowledge before us an imperative demand is upon Congress to go forward actively and energetically with a system of river and harbor improvements.

Mr. Speaker, while we are considering the question of the transportation of the products of the various industries of our country and the cost thereof, we should treat the subject from the broadest point of view. To my mind, the condition of the wagon roads, over which 90 per cent of all the commerce of the country is transported, presents a problem for legislation by Congress far more serious and important in its results than that of railroad-rate regulation. The tax imposed on agricultural products between the starting point and the railroad station or river landing by the miserable condition of these dirt roads is very much greater than the railroad or steamboat charges for carrying them to their ultimate destination. There is no necessity for making an argument to prove the value of good roads. They save worry, waste, and energy. They economize time, labor, and money, and enhance the value of property.

The authority and constitutional warrant for governmental aid to road construction is as old as the Government itself. Jefferson, Clay, Calhoun, and Webster were all in their day advocates of Government aid for good roads. Jefferson said:

Give us peace until our revenues are liberated from debt, and during peace we may checker our whole country with canals and good roads. This is the object to which all our endeavors should be directed.

He further said:

I experience great satisfaction at seeing my country proceed to facilitate the intercommunication of its several parts by opening rivers, canals, and roads. How much more rational is this disposal of public money than that of waging war.

Madison, in his messages to Congress, urged this policy of road building by the Government. Clay, Webster, and Calhoun, that great triumvirate and champions of the people's rights, all favored appropriations from the Federal Treasury for road construction. Good roads are the initial fountains of commerce. The cost of hauling agricultural products alone over our dirt roads in their present condition is estimated by the Agricultural Department to be \$600,000,000 a year more than it would be over a system of good roads. It is estimated every time

the sun sets the American farmers have lost \$1,500,000 because of the poor condition of the roads. The following table of cost of transportation by the three means enumerated will perhaps interest and instruct our farmer friends:

Cost of hauling per ton, horsepower, over dirt roads 5 miles.....	\$1. 25
Cost of hauling per ton, steam power, 250 miles.....	1. 25
Cost of hauling per ton, by river, 500 miles.....	1. 25
Cost of hauling per ton, by steamship on Lakes, 1,000 miles.....	1. 25

It will be seen from the above figures that the amount of money it takes to haul a ton 5 miles on our dirt roads will pay the freight for 250 miles on a railroad or 500 miles on a river and 1,000 miles on the Lakes. These figures prove conclusively the enormous tax levied by the bad roads on the farmers, and how much of their legitimate profit is consumed in hauling from the farms to the railroad station, river landing, and to the towns and cities. Not only have the farmers suffered great loss on account of poor roads, but the people in the towns and cities who depend upon them for their supplies have suffered also.

The residents of towns and cities are willing to stand their share of the expense for a system of good roads. They are the gainers because in the end they must stand a great portion of the cost of hauling farm products; they are the gainers because with good roads there will never be an oversupply of farm products in good weather and a scarcity in bad weather; they are the gainers because the mail-order business has been improved since the introduction of rural free delivery and because this increase is but the beginning of what it will be when good roads are the rule instead of the exception; they are the gainers because every act which promotes the general welfare of the country districts increases the buying power of the farmers and stimulates the commerce which makes the existence of towns and cities a possibility. With good roads the farmer does not wait for a good dry day to market his products, but goes to town in bad weather when he can not work on the farm, and when good weather comes he works to make more to carry to market. Millions of dollars are saved to the farmer by being able to go to market when his products are ready and command the highest price. What the farmer needs and must have before he prospers as his labor and industry entitle him to is good roads, so that he can go to market any day in the year when he has something to sell that somebody else needs. Good roads will make farm life more cheerful and will contribute largely to the happiness and contentment of the farmer and his family, who will become better satisfied with life in the country.

The question of governmental road construction has been successfully tried for many years in other countries. The rural population are entitled to share in the benefits bestowed by the National Government. The expense to them of improving and building roads should not be an item of worry. Roads are built and improved by contract, and the farmer can always get a good price for his labor and team when not needed on the farm. The work is usually done during the summer months when the farmer is not engaged in his crop. He can get from \$3 to \$4 per day for himself and team. The cost of hauling is more than half the expense of building roads in agricultural districts, and therefore instead of being a burden it will become a source of revenue, and his services and that of his team could be profitably employed every day he could spare from the farm. There is timber enough in Alabama too far from any railroad to be profitably hauled to market over the roads in their present condition which if placed on the market would pay for the improvement of every mile of road in that State. If the highways were improved every stick of this timber or the lumber manufactured from it could go to a profitable market, but the mud tax at present imposed makes this impossible.

Mr. Speaker, there is another side to this question of good roads. There is an intellectual side to it. The maintenance and extension of the free-delivery service depends upon good roads. We are appropriating this year \$28,000,000 for the rural delivery service, an increase of \$7,000,000 over the last appropriation for the same class of service. There is no service rendered by the Government that the people in the rural districts appreciate more highly than the delivery of their mails to their doors every day. This service was inaugurated in the year 1896, about ten years ago. Its growth has been phenomenal. When the Post-Office Department began the experiment of sending the mail to the doors of more than 20,000,000 farmers it was predicted that the expense would be so enormous that the task would never be accomplished. By the extension of rural free delivery farm life is made more attractive, and the farmer comes into daily contact with the social and business world. Every day he may receive market reports, which tell him of the price of every product he

may have to sell. The daily newspapers and magazines can also be received.

The extension and perfection of this service depends largely upon the condition of the country roads. Last year 456 petitions were filed for the establishment of rural free-delivery routes in Alabama, 225 of which were reported adversely by the inspector and 224 were established. Half of the routes petitioned for were rejected mainly on account of the unsatisfactory condition of the roads over which the carrier would have to travel. Frequently routes are established upon condition that those interested in the route will improve the roads over which it goes. The Constitution gives Congress power to establish post-offices and post-roads, and every road over which there is a rural free-delivery route has been declared by an act of Congress to be a post-road. Therefore it is as much the duty of Congress to provide good roads over which the mails are to be carried as it is to establish post-offices. We are appropriating millions of dollars to build post-offices and to establish rural delivery.

Now let us begin to improve the post-roads so as to increase and extend rural delivery until all the people are supplied with daily mail at their doors. If Congress will appropriate as much money each year toward the improvement of the post-roads over which the mail must pass as it appropriates to the maintenance of the rural delivery system, in a few years the roads will be improved and all the people supplied with daily mail. The good of the service demands it. The rural free-delivery carrier, an employee of the Government, in my opinion, is entitled to better treatment. For six days in the week and fifty-two weeks in the year he is required to drive his wagon and team over a miserably rough road, which kills his horse and wears out his wagon. He is not paid a sum commensurate with his service—not as much as the city carrier, who is not required to furnish a team or wagon and who has splendid streets and pavements to travel while delivering the mail. It is important that the Government should assist in providing him with good roads over which it requires him to travel, so that he may save his horse and wagon from wear and tear and enable him to serve the Government and patrons along his route more efficiently. He should also be given at least fifteen days' vacation each year. All other Government employees receive this consideration.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEE] addressed the House on April 5, in which he discussed Federal aid to road construction. He displayed such an intimate knowledge of the subject and stated so many homely truths that I beg to quote his language. He said:

If the Army needs a road, it gets it. Even our unprofitable and expensive possessions, the Philippine Islands in the Far East, have been the objects of our solicitous care to the extent of expending \$5,000,000 in building roads for them. Porto Rico, though not much larger in area than some of our counties, has had over \$3,000,000 expended upon its roads since it came into our possession. During our brief occupancy of the island of Cuba our Government expended two and a half millions upon its public roads. Even those little dots out in the Pacific, the Hawaiian Islands, acquired by diplomatic legerdemain, have come in for a share and have a contemplated expenditure of two and a half millions upon their roads.

These various sums aggregate \$13,000,000 that have been expended during the past few years in building roads, not a foot of which lie within the United States. What have we against our own people that we should deny to them blessings that are freely extended to the idle islanders of the seas?

But other interests and forces are coming to the aid of the solitary, the isolated, the unorganized, and almost unorganizable farmer. The manufacturer, learning from experience that bad roads interfere materially with his obtaining steady and continuous supplies of raw material, wants the roads improved. The millions of operatives in mines, mills, and shops are learning that bad roads increase the cost and disturb the regular supply of food products from the farms which they must have, and they want better roads. The merchant has learned that bad roads retard and depress trade, and he wants them mended. Our Post-Office Department is greatly hindered and hampered in its efforts to supply to the country regular, prompt, and reliable mail service for lack of better roads. In fact, it would be hard to name an interest, an industry, or an individual who would not be benefited by better roads.

Mr. Speaker, there are several bills pending before Congress looking to the improvement of the highways and post-roads of the country, one of which I introduced myself. The bills provide that nothing therein contained shall prevent the States or Territories or civil divisions thereof from receiving credit for labor, material, and machinery used in the construction or improvement of said highways or sections thereof. The appropriations provided shall be distributed in the following manner:

No State or Territory shall receive in any one year a larger proportion of the sum hereby appropriated than its population bears to the total population of the United States.

It will be seen that this provision prevents one State or Territory from receiving more of the appropriation than its just proportion. Why should the farmers of the country be required to bear the whole burden of constructing and maintaining the

highways and post-roads? They are not for their exclusive use. They are free to everyone who desires to travel over them or to transport commodities of any kind. Indeed, those who at present are compelled to construct and maintain these roads derive less benefit in actual returns than those who do not contribute one cent to construction and maintenance. It is the duty of the Government to give these patient, toiling people a "square deal."

Let us hasten the day when the public highways and the rivers of the United States shall become great arteries of commerce and potent factors in producing that wealth and prosperity which will indeed make us the greatest and happiest people on the earth.

MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

Mr. WANGER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the conference report on the bill (S. 4250) to further enlarge the powers and the authority of the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service and impose further duties thereon, and ask that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WANGER] calls up the following conference report and asks unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection as to the latter part of the request?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 4250) to further enlarge the powers and authority of the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service and to impose further duties thereon, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

In line 6, section 1, page 1, strike out the word "seacoast" and insert in lieu thereof the words "coast line;" and the House agree to the same.

In line 13, section 1, page 1, strike out the word "seacoast" and insert in lieu thereof the words "coast line;" and the House agree to the same.

In lines 1 and 2, section 1, page 2, strike out the words "having on board any person with yellow fever and;" and the House agree to the same.

In line 4, section 5, page 6, after the word "purposes," insert the words "and the quarantine stations established by authority of this act shall, when so established, be used to prevent the introduction of all quarantinable diseases;" and the House agree to the same.

In lines 10 and 11, section 6, page 6, strike out the words "or any permanent structures or improvements be made or maintained thereon;" and the House agree to the same.

Strike out all of section 7; and the House agree to the same.

In line 10, section 8, page 7, after the word "fever," insert the words "and other quarantinable diseases;" and the House agree to the same.

In line 12, section 8, page 7, after the word "eradicating," strike out the word "it" and insert in lieu thereof the word "them;" and the House agree to the same.

In line 12, section 8, page 7, after the word "should," strike out the word "it" and insert in lieu thereof the word "they;" and the House agree to the same.

In line 13, section 8, page 7, after the word "preventing," strike out the word "its" and insert in lieu thereof the word "their;" and the House agree to the same.

In line 14, section 8, page 7, after the word "destroying," strike out the words "its cause" and insert in lieu thereof the words "their causes;" and the House agree to the same.

W. P. HEPBURN,
IRVING P. WANGER,
C. L. BARTLETT,

Managers on the part of the House.

JOHN C. SPOONER,
FRANK B. BRANDEGEE,
S. R. MALLORY,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

The Clerk read the statement, as follows:

STATEMENT.

That managers on the part of the House on the disagreeing vote of the two Houses on Senate bill No. 4250, make the following statement to accompany the conference report thereon:

The Senate recedes from the House amendments and agrees

to the same with the eleven amendments thereto following to be agreed to by the House.

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2 are phraseological, by inserting in lieu of the word "seacoast" the words "coast line," whereby all question respecting the application of the bill to the coast of the Gulf of Mexico is avoided;

Amendment No. 3 relieves the bill of superfluous language and avoids possible controversy;

Amendment No. 4 makes clear the utility of the quarantine stations after establishment for all proper quarantine purposes;

Amendment No. 5 permits improvements pending the cession of jurisdiction by the State;

Amendment No. 6 removes from the bill its only provision with reference to interstate commerce;

Amendment No. 7 enlarges the purpose for which the appropriation is made;

Amendments Nos. 8, 9, 10, and 11 are phraseological and harmonize the language of the section with amendment No. 7.

W. P. HEPBURN,
IRVING P. WANGER,
C. L. BARTLETT,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WANGER. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. WANGER, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

COLLECTION DISTRICTS IN TEXAS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 10715) to establish additional collection districts in the State of Texas, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER announced the following conferees: Mr. CURTIS, Mr. BOUTELL, and Mr. CLARK of Missouri.

SUBDIVISION OF PUBLIC LANDS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 18536) providing for the subdivision of lands entered under the reclamation act, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER announced the following conferees: Mr. MONDELL, Mr. REEDER, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for present consideration of a resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Invalid Pensions be authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be required in the transaction of its business during the Fifty-ninth Congress.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and the resolution was agreed to.

SUNDRY CIVIL BILL.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 19844) making appropriation for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 19844—the sundry civil appropriation bill—with Mr. WATSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask now to return to page 66, beginning at line 3, the first paragraph under the head of "Expenses of collection of revenue from sales of public lands."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota calls up that portion of the sundry civil bill commencing on line 3, page 66, "Expenses of the collection of revenue from sales of public lands," which was passed over without prejudice on a previous day. The Clerk will read the paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXPENSES OF THE COLLECTION OF REVENUE FROM SALES OF PUBLIC LANDS.

Salaries and commissions of registers and receivers: For salaries and commissions of registers of district land offices and receivers of public moneys at district land offices, at not exceeding \$3,000 per annum each, \$500,000.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At end of line 9, page 66, insert the following:

"That no receivers of public moneys for land districts shall hereafter be appointed, and in all cases where the term of office of such receiver for any land district has expired or shall hereafter expire, and in all cases where the office of such receiver for any land district has or shall become vacant by reason of death, resignation, or removal, all the powers, duties, obligations, and penalties lawfully imposed upon such receivers and upon the registers of the land office for such district shall be imposed upon and exercised by such registers; and such registers shall, in addition to the duties thus imposed, have charge of and attend to the public sale of Indian lands within their respective districts, as provided by law and official regulation, and shall be accountable under their official bonds for the proceeds of such sales and for all fees, commissions, and other moneys received by them under any provision of law or official regulation; and all fees and commissions now allowable under law to both such registers and receivers shall, in all land offices for which there is no receiver of public moneys, be paid to and accounted for by the register in the same manner and in like amounts in which they are now required to be paid to and accounted for by such receivers; but the compensation of such registers shall in no case exceed \$3,000 per annum.

That the Secretary of the Interior may appoint or designate a deputy register, without regard to the requirements of the classified service, for any land office in which there is not a receiver of public moneys, which chief clerk shall receive such salary, payable from the appropriation for contingent expenses of land offices, as the Commissioner of the General Land Office may authorize, and such chief clerk shall perform such duties as may be directed by the register of the land office for which he is appointed, or by official regulation, and he shall, during the absence of such register, or in case of a vacancy in the office of such register, exercise all the powers, perform all the duties, and be subject to all the obligations and penalties imposed upon such register by law or official regulation; but such chief clerk shall, before entering upon the duties of his office, execute to the United States a bond in such penal sum as the said Secretary may prescribe, with approved security, for the faithful performance of his official duties; and such chief clerk shall be accountable under his official bond for such proceeds arising from the sale of public or Indian lands within his district, and for such fees, commissions, and other moneys as may come into his hands under any law or official regulation or direction.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order this is new legislation.

Mr. LACEY. I will ask the gentleman from Wyoming to reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order or reserve it?

Mr. MONDELL. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman makes the point of order. Does the gentleman from Iowa desire to be heard?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I hope the gentleman will reserve the point of order until we can discuss the question.

Mr. LACEY. I would like to be heard on the proposition.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The matter was voted down in the committee, and not considered in the committee, and we are anxious to consider it in the House on its merits.

Mr. MONDELL. I insist on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming makes the point of order. Does the gentleman from Iowa desire to discuss the point of order?

Mr. LACEY. I would like to be heard before the point of order is disposed of.

Mr. Chairman, this is a proposition to save the United States of America \$250,000 a year, and I thought perhaps a proposition to save the Government \$250,000 is so unusual that the point of order would not be suggested against it.

Mr. MONDELL. I understand the gentleman rises to discuss the point of order?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The gentleman will certainly allow the gentleman from Iowa to state his premises and state the law, so that he can discuss the point of order as to whether it is an unusual proposition.

Mr. LACEY. It is an unusual proposition, unquestionably. It will save this amount of money a year; and it being so unusual, it may be said to be new, at least in this respect.

But, Mr. Chairman, every once in a while I feel the wisdom of the old Holman rule, that any amendment on an appropriation bill which reduces the expenditures and saves money to the Government ought to be competent, ought to be proper. I suppose that as a matter of parliamentary law this amendment is a new proposition; but yet I would like to have the Chair fully understand it before ruling upon it.

In 1796 the land law was first enacted, providing for the opening of the Northwest Territory. It provided that the governor of that Territory and the Secretary of the Treasury should sell

the public land. Later on the act of May 10, 1800, was passed, which provided for the registers of the land office to make the sales and for receivers of the public moneys. The condition at that time was peculiar. The public moneys received consisted of bank bills of various values and denominations, of Spanish milled dollars, of French money—in fact, of almost all kinds of money except money of the United States—and the proposition of taking care of that money and getting it into the Treasury involved a good deal of difficulty, so that a special officer was selected for that purpose. That officer being thus designated and not being fully employed, ultimately was given authority to sit in connection with the register in land cases. Having been given that jurisdiction, the office of receiver has been maintained from 1800 down to the present time, long after all necessity for its existence has disappeared.

The Commissioner of the General Land Office and the Secretary of the Interior in their official report this year have asked that this office be abolished, and that the Register of the Land Office be directed to perform the functions, which he can do without difficulty. There is no necessity for a receiver now. There is always a national bank near into which the money may be turned as a deposit by all land officers of the United States, or nearly all, and by registered mail and postal orders the money can be readily covered into the Treasury without loss or delay. The receiver is no longer necessary.

Now, this proposition in the form in which I offer it does not do away at once with the receivers, but permits them to go out of office as their terms expire, and when one of them goes out there shall be no reappointment. The actual expense, as shown by the Commissioner of the Land Office, of this office for the last five years up to last June has been \$1,471,216. If the office is abolished, it will be necessary to have one of the clerks in the office designated to perform the duties of register in the absence of the register, and to perform the duties heretofore performed by the receiver in the absence of the register also. It will require the appointment of about twenty-five chief clerks in offices that now have no clerk and the designation of a chief clerk in each of the others from among the clerical force of the office.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that the gentleman rose to discuss the point of order.

Mr. LACEY. I am stating the proposition first.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa stated to the Chair that he desired to discuss the point of order. The Chair indulges the presumption that the gentleman from Iowa is laying the foundation for his discussion of the point of order.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. "How firm a foundation, ye saints of the Lord!" [Laughter.]

Mr. LACEY. I think if the gentleman from Wyoming understands the proposition, he should withdraw the point of order in order to save the expenses of five or six receivers in his State. It would increase the irrigation fund by that much.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LACEY. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. I do not want to ask a question that would in anywise induce the gentleman to discuss the merits of the proposition, but he said something a moment ago about the number of clerks that would have to be appointed.

Mr. LACEY. Yes; there would be about twenty-five.

Mr. RUCKER. At increased salaries, and at every session of Congress following we would be asked to increase them.

Mr. LACEY. Oh, no; not at all. A clerk in every office that has a clerk now can be designated to act.

Mr. RUCKER. Would it not mean that about twenty-five dudes from the District of Columbia would be sent out to these land offices to do the work that ought to be done by people living in the district?

Mr. LACEY. No; the amendment provides that they shall be selected outside the civil service, so that we would be relieved from that difficulty as to these particular appointments.

The CHAIRMAN. It seems to the Chair that we are wandering somewhat from the point of order.

Mr. LACEY. I am being led away from the point of order by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER].

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I desire to ask the gentleman a question in regard to a statement of fact which he has made. I believe he has stated the figures which would represent the saving in expense to the Government if receivers were done away with.

Mr. LACEY. Yes; there would be that saving.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I should like to ask the gentleman if the fees of registers and receivers are not based upon the moneys which they receive, and is it not a fact that in many instances those fees are paid by entrymen?

Mr. LACEY. Substantially all paid by entrymen.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Is it not true that there is no salary for registers and receivers above \$500 a year, except commissions; that is, that if the commissions exceed \$500 a year, no salary is paid?

Mr. LACEY. We appropriated last year out of the commissions received by these officers for their public services \$285,835. Under this proposition that would all have been saved, every dollar of it, except about \$25,000 to pay for additional clerks, leaving a net saving of about \$260,000, based on last year's business. Now, I wish to incorporate in my remarks a statement made by the Commissioner of the General Land Office. The salary of each receiver is \$500, with fees of his office in addition up to \$3,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to inquire whether, in the opinion of the Chair, the gentleman is speaking on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that up to this time the gentleman has not seriously discussed the point of order.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, I have almost completed my statement as to the facts. I want to incorporate the statement of the Commissioner, which I will not take the time to read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understood the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] yesterday to say that he was going to object to all extraneous debate. I do not see him in his seat at this moment, and I feel somewhat disposed, as a personal friend of his, to do that which he gave notice he would do if he were here. I do not think this can possibly bear upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks not.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, it does bear upon the point of order, because it states the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa has the floor, if he has anything to say on the point of order. [Cries of "Rule!" "Rule!"]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield to me, I should like to ask what improvement on present conditions it is claimed that this amendment will make?

Mr. LACEY. It will provide that one man shall do the work heretofore duplicated by two. It is just the opposite of the old proposition of making two blades of grass where only one grew before. We would have one employee of the Government where we had two before. The work would be done as well by one.

Mr. GROSVENOR. And it would change the law to that extent?

Mr. LACEY. It would change the law to that extent.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Then is there any necessity to argue this point any further on the point of order made by the gentleman?

Mr. LACEY. It is not a mere question of academic study. I think it is for the Committee on Rules to give us an opportunity to save this amount of money, and that is the reason I want to get the facts before the House.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to discuss the point of order. I think it is not necessary to discuss it at any great length.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule on the proposition.

Mr. MONDELL. I desire to discuss it briefly for the enlightenment of the Chair and the House. The gentleman from Iowa, discussing the point of order, made the claim that it was in the interest of economy. If, as a matter of fact, it was permissible in discussing the point of order to go into that question of economy, it would be clearly demonstrated to the satisfaction of every Member of the House that the Government would not save a penny by the abolition of the office of receiver of the General Land Office.

Mr. PAYNE. If that is correct, why not reserve the point of order and let us discuss it? I would like a little light on it myself.

Mr. MONDELL. My understanding is that the committee desire to get on with the bill and did not desire to have a long discussion on the subject. As a matter of fact, this would lead to a substitution of officers appointed by the President for the performance of important duties with which they are acquainted, by civil-service clerks, and in the main the change would be an additional charge upon the Treasury. The gentleman seemed to have forgotten that of this appropriation of \$400,000 only \$117,000 is a charge upon the Treasury of the United States, the balance being funds received as fees and commissions, and if we save this amount it will flow not into the Treasury of the United States, but into the reclamation fund.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is well taken, and the Chair is ready to rule. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, in line 7, page 66, I move to strike out the following words: "And receivers of public moneys."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 7, page 66, strike out the words "and receivers of public money."

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that is a change of existing law and new legislation.

Mr. LACEY. I am ready for the Chair to rule on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order. A motion to strike out is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. LACEY. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think I have already obtained leave to insert in my remarks the report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office upon this subject; and if not, I ask leave to do it now.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa to print as a part of his remarks the extract from the report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office?

There was no objection.

The following is the portion of the report referred to:

RECOMMENDATION THAT THE OFFICE OF RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS FOR UNITED STATES LAND OFFICES SHOULD BE ABOLISHED AND A QUARTER OF A MILLION DOLLARS ANNUALLY SAVED TO THE GOVERNMENT.

The office of receiver of public moneys was created by the act of May 10, 1800 (2 Stat. L., 73), whereby four land offices were established, each to be under the direction of an officer to be called a register of the land office. Certain lands were, by the terms of the act, to be sold, and all the payments therefor were to be made either to the Treasurer of the United States or to such person or officer as should be appointed by the President of the United States, with the advice and consent of the Senate, receiver of public moneys.

By that act the duties of receivers were, generally speaking, to receive and receipt for moneys paid for the purchase of lands and duly pay over and account for the same. Subsequently, as other land offices were created, the several acts establishing the same made the same provisions for the appointment of a register and receiver at each, and this is a requirement of the law as it now stands. (See R. S., sec. 2234.)

The apparent object in appointing receivers was, perhaps, mainly for the convenience of purchasers of public lands, who were thereby relieved of the necessity of making payments directly to the Treasurer of the United States, and given an officer to whom, and a place where, payments in purchase of lands might be made with a minimum of inconvenience. In those days the transmission of money from the frontier to the Treasury was attended with much trouble, cost, and danger of loss.

The duty of the register, as his name implies, was largely that of a recording officer.

Under the act referred to neither the register nor receiver was clothed with any judicial function, nor were they required to act jointly in any particular. The judicial, or quasi-judicial, function appears to have been first conferred by the act of March 3, 1819, which provided that the register and receiver would hear testimony relative to mistakes and report the same with their opinion to the Treasurer of the United States.

By the act of May 24, 1824 (4 Stat. L., 31), the register and receiver, or either of them, might administer an oath.

By the act of May 29, 1830 (4 Stat. L., 420), proof of settlement and improvements should be made to the satisfaction of the register and receiver.

By the act of June 1, 1840 (5 Stat. L., 382) a preemptor was required to make satisfactory proof of his or her residence before the register and receiver.

By the act of September 4, 1841 (5 Stat. L., 456), questions as to the rights of preemption, arising between different settlers, were to be settled by the register and receiver, subject to appeal and revision by the Secretary of the Treasury, whose appellate jurisdiction was transferred to the General Land Office by section 10 of the act of June 12, 1858 (11 Stat. L., 326).

The substance of the two last-mentioned acts is expressed in section 2273, Revised Statutes. Indeed in every instance the judicial, or quasi-judicial, function has been conferred jointly upon the register and receiver, except where abandonment is, by the terms of section 2297, Revised Statutes, required to be proven to "the satisfaction of the register of the land office." Yet by the rules of practice, even in cases of abandonment, as in the trial of all other issues before the local office, both register and receiver must pass in judgment thereon. It is now firmly established that the office is one, while its body is dual. A vacancy in either office disqualifies the remaining incumbent for the performance of the duties of his own office.

From a consideration of the foregoing it appears that the duties of the receiver have been gradually extended from those of merely receiving and accounting for public moneys to those of an officer vested with judicial functions, joint and coordinate with that of the register.

It is believed that existing conditions are such as to warrant and suggest the abolition of the office of the receiver, and the vesting in the register of the functions now performed by the receiver, for the following reasons:

1. The volume of work now transacted and receipts of money at many, if not all, of the local offices is not such as to require the services of both officers.

The following table, covering all the land offices, shows the number of clerks, the number of entries, the total receipts, and the total expense of each office; and also shows the compensation of each receiver (the register and receiver each receive the same compensation) for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1905:

Land office.	Number of—		Total receipts.	Expense of maintaining office.	Compensation of receivers.
	Clerks.	Entries.			
Huntsville, Ala.		637	\$5,532.05	\$3,421.54	\$1,257.69
Montgomery, Ala.	2	1,489	22,662.70	6,762.62	2,403.21
Juneau, Alaska		167	10,432.91	4,575.58	1,940.12
Prescott, Ariz.		776	17,264.80	4,043.96	1,754.79
Tucson, Ariz.	1	627	40,187.76	7,042.90	2,786.30
Camden, Ark.	2	1,806	35,022.91	8,528.09	3,000.00
Dardanelle, Ark.	1	851	15,465.12	4,759.73	1,999.84
Harrison, Ark.	2	2,302	44,427.08	8,767.37	3,000.00
Little Rock, Ark.	1	998	12,977.87	6,426.21	2,322.87
Eureka, Cal.	1	579	52,290.58	7,523.11	2,679.73
Independence, Cal.		124	7,661.83	2,181.64	985.66
Los Angeles, Cal.	2	3,465	46,876.10	9,612.50	3,000.00
Marysville, Cal.		200	12,409.74	2,968.32	1,297.10
Redding, Cal.	1	659	53,891.27	7,481.48	3,000.00
Sacramento, Cal.	1	350	24,951.99	5,489.75	2,214.94
San Francisco, Cal.	2	1,003	32,541.08	8,248.48	3,000.00
Stockton, Cal.		523	17,403.52	4,863.10	2,418.59
Susanville, Cal.	1	1,563	266,367.23	7,804.18	3,000.00
Visalia, Cal.		849	21,156.70	4,302.68	1,916.34
Akron, Colo.		287	4,990.83	2,953.04	1,316.60
Del Norte, Colo.		237	8,464.57	2,633.48	1,178.18
Denver, Colo.	2	1,840	93,726.55	9,120.01	3,000.00
Durango, Colo.	1	687	28,349.88	7,185.38	2,703.12
Glenwood, Colo.	1	1,057	107,577.73	8,476.81	3,000.00
Gunnison, Colo.		201	5,607.95	2,422.28	1,134.78
Hugo, Colo.		441	8,350.15	4,950.92	2,356.65
Lamar, Colo.		190	4,016.67	3,019.55	1,135.28
Leadville, Colo.		203	12,180.08	3,588.96	1,300.37
Montrose, Colo.	1	647	10,902.49	6,546.10	2,380.94
Pueblo, Colo.	4	1,301	70,400.17	10,902.53	3,000.00
Sterling, Colo.		259	5,504.01	3,312.01	1,387.75
Gainesville, Fla.	4	2,936	77,076.73	11,064.00	3,000.00
Blackfoot, Idaho	2	1,502	53,406.71	8,586.43	3,000.00
Boise, Idaho	3	1,913	120,357.90	9,627.42	3,000.00
Coeur d'Alene, Idaho	1	981	110,984.50	8,939.79	3,000.00
Hailey, Idaho	1	1,542	30,244.90	6,627.86	2,940.82
Lewiston, Idaho	2	1,684	109,942.34	9,829.52	3,000.00
Des Moines, Iowa		4	719.25	1,688.22	747.81
Colby, Kans.		610	9,670.28	5,620.27	2,114.64
Dodge City, Kans.	3	1,298	22,998.20	8,090.67	2,833.28
Topeka, Kans.		47	1,322.50	1,829.17	653.13
Wakeney, Kans.		439	8,068.70	3,635.09	1,552.83
Natchitoches, La.	1	764	23,713.63	5,833.90	2,249.75
New Orleans, La.	3	1,457	41,562.83	9,221.55	3,000.00
Marquette, Mich.	2	822	42,569.23	8,269.81	2,984.28
Cass Lake, Minn.	2	1,358	68,599.18	9,102.82	3,000.00
Crookston, Minn.	2	2,581	46,602.18	9,171.35	3,000.00
Duluth, Minn.	2	2,985	243,680.02	11,273.94	3,000.00
St. Cloud, Minn.	1	718	14,147.06	5,328.08	2,012.02
Jackson, Miss.	3	1,798	32,342.31	8,718.17	2,806.76
Boonville, Mo.		469	12,602.46	2,759.13	1,194.95
Ironton, Mo.		489	9,485.66	2,620.40	1,209.69
Springfield, Mo.	2	817	15,356.28	4,912.67	1,794.90
Bozeman, Mont.	2	1,749	48,625.20	8,561.02	3,000.00
Great Falls, Mont.	2	2,177	112,583.74	9,060.15	3,000.00
Helena, Mont.	2	1,406	64,013.31	8,446.98	3,000.00
Kalispell, Mont.	1	801	41,705.92	7,416.95	2,935.75
Lewistown, Mont.	1	1,141	78,797.98	7,933.37	3,000.00
Miles City, Mont.	1	1,703	20,551.70	7,342.43	3,000.00
Missoula, Mont.	1	1,126	38,577.97	8,624.18	3,000.00
Alliance, Mont.	1	3,751	59,682.75	9,146.39	3,000.00
Broken Bow, Nebr.	1	1,886	27,437.21	7,775.94	3,000.00
Lincoln, Nebr.		280	6,282.18	2,416.23	1,105.04
McCook, Nebr.		538	9,390.07	3,013.74	1,237.83
North Platte, Nebr.	1	1,302	22,808.81	7,115.94	3,000.00
O'Neill, Nebr.	1	1,833	37,795.40	8,189.10	3,000.00
Sidney, Nebr.		696	10,043.55	4,982.34	2,053.23
Valentine, Nebr.	1	3,112	45,622.82	8,572.22	3,000.00
Carson City, Nev.	1	854	14,072.74	3,923.43	1,952.52
Clayton, N. Mex.	1	1,707	19,503.72	7,544.71	3,000.00
Las Cruces, N. Mex.		490	13,843.51	3,723.30	1,702.63
Roswell, N. Mex.	1	1,866	71,337.89	7,807.15	3,000.00
Santa Fe, N. Mex.	2	1,079	51,057.63	8,361.13	3,000.00
Bismarck, N. Dak.	5	3,784	136,958.50	11,774.37	3,000.00
Devils Lake, N. Dak.	4	4,058	182,708.37	10,963.29	3,000.00
Dickinson, N. Dak.	2	2,244	29,892.48	10,102.02	2,935.00
Fargo, N. Dak.		631	20,377.97	6,184.11	2,671.80
Grand Forks, N. Dak.		431	14,705.19	3,336.88	1,451.50
Minot, N. Dak.	8	8,770	481,433.81	14,351.26	3,000.00
Alva, Okla.	1	1,061	22,365.34	7,083.07	2,978.08
El Reno, Okla.	2	1,225	91,117.64	10,678.52	3,000.00
Guthrie, Okla.	2	837	13,028.57	8,460.25	3,000.00
Kingfisher, Okla.	2	2,139	39,848.65	8,961.72	3,000.00
Lawton, Okla.	2	1,101	169,178.71	10,250.95	3,000.00
Mangum, Okla.	2	2,123	66,069.15	8,675.48	3,000.00
Woodward, Okla.	5	4,350	123,573.97	13,099.40	2,658.50
Burns, Oreg.		591	26,833.06	4,583.30	1,974.63
La Grande, Oreg.	3	1,970	150,756.48	10,159.85	3,000.00
Lakeview, Oreg.	1	868	112,404.75	8,204.00	3,000.00
Oregon City, Oreg.	2	809	84,419.79	8,558.57	3,000.00
Roseburg, Oreg.	3	1,041	131,653.89	8,436.03	2,234.00
The Dalles, Oreg.	4	2,715	158,391.05	10,682.47	3,000.00
Aberdeen, S. Dak.	1	744	31,225.58	6,035.83	2,324.30
Chamberlain, S. Dak.	3	5,082	90,749.30	10,298.45	3,000.00
Huron, S. Dak.		654	29,312.14	5,134.52	1,915.58
Mitchell, S. Dak.		437	13,110.77	6,435.98	1,424.73
Pierre, S. Dak.	2	1,294	26,925.14	8,373.77	2,842.52
Rapid City, S. Dak.	2	1,418	48,590.27	9,273.98	3,000.00
Watertown, S. Dak.		479	11,686.07	5,537.42	2,203.47
Salt Lake, Utah	2	1,661	86,056.58	10,624.24	3,000.00
Vernal, Utah					
North Yakima, Wash.	1	635	27,457.78	7,452.19	3,000.00
Olympia, Wash.		305	34,344.32	5,686.29	2,072.83
Seattle, Wash.	2	781	88,979.04	9,275.73	3,000.00
Spokane, Wash.	2	1,429	68,847.58	9,674.80	3,000.00
Vancouver, Wash.	2	1,403	109,976.74	8,999.00	3,000.00
Walla Walla, Wash.	2	1,632	84,676.61	7,845.71	3,000.00

Land office.	Number of—		Total receipts.	Expense of maintaining office.	Compensation of receivers.
	Clerks.	Entries.			
Waterville, Wash.	2	2,069	\$39,761.87	\$8,783.88	\$3,000.00
Ashland, Wis.		444	14,534.89	4,194.06	1,924.10
Eau Claire, Wis.		560	8,444.18	4,294.39	1,574.35
Wausau, Wis.		535	10,306.16	3,587.80	1,498.37
Buffalo, Wyo.	1	932	53,260.97	7,087.68	3,000.00
Cheyenne, Wyo.	2	933	43,601.38	8,578.30	3,000.00
Douglas, Wyo.		538	26,760.15	5,681.44	2,071.84
Evanston, Wyo.		508	46,861.11	5,871.07	2,303.14
Lander, Wyo.		543	25,270.41	3,990.00	1,815.76
Sundance, Wyo.	1	1,018	26,889.03	7,379.36	2,888.59
117 offices	154	149,284	6,136,376.76	815,486.15	285,835.22

Of the foregoing offices, the following have recently been abolished: Huntsville, Ala.; Prescott, Ariz.; Marysville, Cal.; Akron, Colo.; Wakeney, Kans.; Booneville and Ironton, Mo.; McCook, Nebr., and Ashland and Eau Claire, Wis.

II. The existence of the dual responsibility is the occasion of frequent and chronic disagreement between the register and receiver, to the consequent prejudice of the local office, its conduct, and all who are affected thereby. Each charges the other with responsibility for any neglect or misfeasance which may be found to exist therein.

This friction develops at times into a recrimination and antagonism which precludes that prompt and cordial cooperation necessary to an effective administration of the joint duties of the dual office, and has been the cause of much complaint from the public affected, and the expenditure of much time and labor by this office and its inspectors in the effort to compose such differences and harmonize the officers at issue, so as to restore them as a working unit to the condition of normal efficiency. It is obvious that a sole responsibility for the conduct of the local office would necessarily tend to a stimulation in the discharge of duty, consequent upon the certain knowledge on the part of the officer responsible that there could be no successful attempt on his part to evade the consequences of neglect or misfeasance by attributing it, as is now frequently done, to his joint associate. The entire clerical force of the office would be under one control and one influence. Exactness of method, certitude of information given out, uniformity of conduct, harmony of decision, and indisputable responsibility for error or misfeasance would take the place of the opposite conditions which are too often prevalent in the local offices.

III. The convenience of frequent access to and inspection of the local offices is now such as to enable this office to keep itself at all times reasonably informed of the method and efficiency of their conduct, as it could not do in former times, owing to the lack of railroads and telegraphic communication between this office and many of its subordinate officials and the absence of the thorough and efficient system of frequent inspection now in force.

The absence of the present system and facilities for communication and inspection may have been one reason which suggested, in the creation of the land offices, the desirability of having two officers who would operate as a check each upon the other. That necessity, for the reasons just stated, no longer exists.

IV. We are now brought to the consideration of the receiver's function as a joint officer.

As hereinbefore pointed out, he is required to act with the register in the performance of every judicial or quasi-judicial function, and the death, removal, or disqualification of either the register or receiver disqualifies the other, and results in practically closing the office, a condition which often occurs.

Such a condition results in great inconvenience and injury to the public and to all those who have or desire to transact business at the local offices, and creates a congestion of business often difficult to work off. All such results as now ensue from the death, removal, resignation, or disqualification of the receiver would be avoided were the register clothed solely with the authority now jointly vested in both officers and suitable provision made for the appointment of a chief clerk to act in the absence of the register.

V. It is believed that the relief from the undesirable conditions hereinbefore pointed out by the abolition of the office of receiver outweighs the problematical benefit ensuing from the exercise of his joint function with the register. It is not clear why he was so jointly vested. Be the reason what it may, now, when the principles which govern the due inception of claims made under the public-land laws are well established, and the local offices are under constant instruction and frequent inspection, and the right of appeal freely given with opportunity for its expeditious exercise and its prompt disposition, with every decision coming under the notice of this office closely scanned for the detection and correction of error therein, it is believed that the desirability for the continuance of the concurrent action by two officers, instead of one, is far less than the necessity for that increased efficiency and economy which may be accomplished by the abolition of the office of receiver.

VI. It is estimated that the abolition of the office of receiver of public moneys will result in a saving to the Government of over \$250,000 per annum.

The following table will show the compensation which has been paid to the several receivers of public moneys for each year for the past five years:

Fiscal year ended June 30—	Total
1901	\$202,480.56
1902	300,757.38
1903	296,803.79
1904	295,339.32
1905	285,835.22

Total for the past five years..... 1,471,216.57

At the present time the following duplicate records are kept in all local land offices, viz: Register of mineral receipts; register of homestead receipts; register of final homestead receipts; register of final receipts, desert lands; register of cash receipts, in which is also kept account of coal-land receipts; homestead duplicate docket.

The apparent reason for keeping these duplicate sets of records is for the purpose of having one officer a check upon the other. But under the present method of handling business in local land offices there is little danger of defalcation or misappropriation of funds, as

the General Land Office keeps a record of all disposals of public land and requires the local offices to properly and promptly account for the moneys they should receive therefor. Therefore, if the office of receiver were abolished the practice of keeping duplicate sets of books would be discontinued and a great saving made in clerical labor in the local land offices, which, it is believed, would offset the loss of the services of the various receivers. There would also be a consequent saving of the cost of furnishing all such duplicate books or records.

After careful consideration of the matter, it is my opinion that should the office of receiver be abolished, with the consequent keeping of the aforementioned records and general simplifying of the work, there would be no necessity for an increase in the clerical force in the various offices where clerks are now employed. It would undoubtedly be necessary to place a clerk in each of the twenty-five offices where none are now employed, and this would require an increase of \$25,000 in the appropriation for contingent expenses of land offices.

Based upon the foregoing, and for the reasons therein stated, I am of opinion that there is no necessity for the continuance of the office of receiver of public moneys for United States land offices, and that it would be in the interest of both economy and good administration to abolish the office and vest the duties of receiver in the register, the act to go into effect July 1, 1906.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to say very briefly that there is absolutely no necessity for the continuation of the office of receiver of the land office. The work is duplicated by the register and the receiver. All of their work is substantially duplicated. When they sit together as judges in hearing a land case, if they disagree, there is no decision, and it must be certified by the Land Office, and if they agree, it does not strengthen the proposition. So that in any event these offices now are supernumerary. The reasons that existed in 1800, when the law was passed, have long since passed away. If it is a desirable office, it carries a salary of \$3,000 a year, with very little, if anything, to do, and there is nothing so sacred as an abuse; there is nothing so persistent as a sinecure, and these offices have persisted all these years, until now the Department itself has come to Congress and asked to be relieved from the appointment of any more of them, and that one man should be permitted to perform the duties which practically he has to do anyhow, and the Government should be relieved from the additional expense.

Mr. HOGG. Will the gentleman from Iowa permit a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. LACEY. Certainly.

Mr. HOGG. If your amendment prevails, what will be the effect on the local land office—what officer is authorized to receive the money?

Mr. LACEY. If this amendment prevails, some different arrangement will have to be made. That is one way of getting a remedy when an abuse occurs. When an abuse occurs and we can not get it in any other way, we should strike out the appropriation. Congress will then be compelled to act, and that is one of the remedies that Congress always has in its hands. Let me illustrate. Suppose this involved the prerogatives of the Senate, the appointment of all these receivers, 103, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and they did not desire to relinquish that prerogative; the House can cut off supplies and compel action in this way. That is the object of this amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the gentleman really suppose the House would ever have the courage to do it?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Under the law as it now stands, or, rather, is not this the law, that the Secretary of the Interior has the power to make the necessary rules and regulations to carry out the laws which Congress ordains, and can not he make proper regulations if we strike out this appropriation?

Mr. LACEY. I do not think so.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I think he can.

Mr. LACEY. I think if we strike out this appropriation we will have exercised the high function of the House of Representatives to do away with offices by refusing the salaries, and thus requiring some further legislation in order that public business may proceed.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa if it is not true that the mere effect of striking out this appropriation will in no way relieve the liability of the Government to pay the receivers? Their duties are prescribed by law. They are appointive officers. They will perform their duties, and their salaries continue and the Government will be liable.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Where is there any authority to pay them unless Congress makes an appropriation?

Mr. POWERS. They will go to the Court of Claims and get it.

Mr. LACEY. This method is an heroic remedy, and one that has been very seldom applied. It is a remedy that was used against the Crown in the old country and used with effect. It

is a remedy that can be used here, and, while it has not been used for many years, here is a good place to put it in operation in this House to-day by cutting off the supplies of these supernumerary and unnecessary officers.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not understand that the gentleman from Iowa answered the question. My question is, Would not the liability of the Government to these receivers continue the same after we failed to make this appropriation as before?

Mr. LACEY. That goes without saying. I think they could go into the Court of Claims. But they would have to ask an appropriation later on, however. They would in the end be compelled to submit to the action of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman proposes by this indirect method to do away with an office established over one hundred and ten years ago. The receivers of United States land offices have been a part of the public land administration since the foundation of the Government, and for the last eighty-five years they have been important judicial officers of the Government. In my opinion no officers of the Government have rendered more helpful or important service than the receivers of the land offices of the country. It is not true that they are supernumeraries. It is not true that the existence of the dual system of register and receiver creates an unnecessary duplication of work to any considerable extent, and so far as it does it is due to departmental regulations which can be amended. These two officials sit as judge, jury, and State's attorney in all land cases. They have to pass upon the rights of contestants appearing before them in cases involving land and mineral values oftentimes running into the millions. They, as the agents of the Government, must settle important and diversified questions of law, fact, and equity as between the Government and settlers and entrymen in the case of practically every tract of public land disposed of in these United States. The system has in the main worked well. There has been little complaint of it in a hundred years until within the past year. Those who have had to do with local land offices, who understand the working of the dual system, believe that to abolish the office of receiver would not only not be in the interest of the Government, but would work great hardship and injustice to the settler and entryman. These officers receive compensation ranging from \$750 to \$3,000. They receive salaries of \$500, the balance of their emoluments being commissions on the sales of land and fees. I do not intend to take up the time of the committee in the discussion of the many and important duties performed by these officers, of the check and safeguard to the interest of the settler and the Government alike which the office insures, but I want to discuss briefly the question from the standpoint of economy.

The gentleman from Iowa has stated that the abolition of this office would result in a saving to the Treasury of the United States of something like \$250,000. Mr. Chairman, I think it can be proven without any difficulty whatever that there would be no saving to the Treasury in the abolition of the office of receiver, but that on the contrary, there will be an additional charge laid on the Treasury by the abolition of this office. As I stated a moment ago, the salaries of registers and receivers are \$500 per annum. There are in the United States 117 local land offices with a register and receiver, whose joint salaries amount to a thousand dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to continue for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. So that the charge upon the Treasury in this item is \$117,000. That sum comes directly out of the Treasury of the United States. The further emoluments of registers and receivers come from fees and commissions. By the terms of the national reclamation act all land fees and commissions over and above those paid registers and receivers flow into the national reclamation fund, so that if you saved by this proposed legislation you would not save to the Treasury of the United States, but to the national reclamation fund.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, who owns the national reclamation fund?

Mr. MONDELL. I think that the United States owns it, but the arid-land States get the benefit of it.

Mr. PAYNE. The money that comes out of that comes out of the United States, does it not?

Mr. MONDELL. Well, not exactly; it comes from the sale of lands and fees and commissions. I come from the part of the country that is benefited by the national reclamation fund. I should be delighted to aid any legislation that would swell

that fund if it could be aided without harm both to the Government and to intending settlers, but it can not be done in this way without working great hardship on settlers and causing a great loss to the Government.

Mr. BONYNGE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. Certainly.

Mr. BONYNGE. Has there been a bill pending before the Committee on Public Lands for the abolition of the office of receivers during this session?

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, yes; this question has been thrashed over—

Mr. BONYNGE. Has the committee made a report?

Mr. MONDELL (continuing). By the committee having jurisdiction of the subject at great length, with the result that that committee almost unanimously refused to abolish these offices. This is thrashing over old straw.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. What committee refused; did the Public Lands Committee refuse unanimously?

Mr. MONDELL. I said almost.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The gentleman is mistaken about that, and we are trying to reconsider it now, and I hope will do so.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; trying to reconsider it, but we have not reconsidered it. The decision was almost unanimous, and the decision of this House would be equally unanimous if the question was fully understood and discussed. In the first place, there would be no saving to the Treasury. If there was any, the saving would be to the national reclamation fund, but, Mr. Chairman, there would be no saving either to the Treasury or to the reclamation fund. The gentlemen are unfortunate in their mathematics. They assume that to abolish the office of receiver means saving of all the fees and commissions now going to the receivers, when, as a matter of fact, under the operation of the law, the moment you abolish the office of receiver in an office below the maximum the fees and commissions up to the maximum go to the remaining officer, and that on the basis of last year's business reduces this alleged saving something like \$125,000. In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, there would be an additional charge upon the Treasury directly, according to the statement of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, by the appointment of twenty-five civil-service clerks at a thousand dollars a year, he says—probably at fifteen hundred dollars—and in addition to that those who are acquainted with the operations of the land laws and the work in local land offices fully appreciate the fact that within a year of the abolition of the office of receiver there would probably be an additional civil-service clerk in every land office in the United States, and these clerks in the aggregate would cost more than the receivers now cost.

There are in the United States at this time 117 land offices. As registers and receivers receive \$500 each in salary, the total amount of this appropriation which is a charge upon the Treasury is the amount of the salaries of these officers, or \$1,000 for each land office, or \$117,000 of the \$500,000 appropriated. The remainder of the appropriation, as I have stated, is simply a limitation upon the total amount which registers and receivers may be allowed to retain of the fees and commissions collected by them during the fiscal year, to which they are entitled by law. Any of this portion of the appropriation if saved, would not flow into the Treasury, but go to the reclamation fund, for then it would become part of those surplus fees and commissions in excess of allowances to registers and receivers which flow into the reclamation fund.

In view of this condition of affairs, let us discuss for a moment the question as to the actual saving to the Treasury of the United States by the abolition of this office. As I have before stated, the actual outlay by the Treasury for the payment of registers and receivers is approximately \$117,000. If the office of receiver were abolished, however, half of this amount or \$58,500 would be saved to the Treasury, provided there were no other charges made upon the Treasury by reason of the abolition of the office; but the Commissioner of the General Land Office, in his statement relative to the abolition of the office, says that it would undoubtedly be necessary to appoint a thousand-dollar civil-service clerk in each one of the twenty-five offices, where no clerk is now employed, to perform the duties now performed by the receiver. This would reduce the saving of \$58,500 to \$23,500 provided that was the only added expense, but I am of the opinion that practically everyone who has had experience with governmental methods and who is informed in regard to the amount of work in local land offices will agree, first, that instead of the Department clerks for \$1,000 apiece to take the places of the receivers, such clerks would ultimately receive at least \$1,500, and that in addition thereto every land office would have an additional clerk if the services of the receiver were

dispensed with, and admitting for the sake of argument that these additional clerks received only \$1,000 apiece, this would entail an expense for salary of \$117,000, where we now pay salaries amounting to \$58,500. So that instead of the Treasury saving \$58,500, there would be an additional charge upon the Treasury of \$58,500 by the change proposed.

It is true that the reclamation fund would gain all that the Treasury lost and more, as all fees and commissions now going to receivers which would not by operation of law go to the register were the former office abolished would go into the reclamation fund. Now, those of us who come from the arid regions, where the reclamation law operates, would be very glad, indeed, to secure this additional sum for the reclamation fund and have the cost of the maintenance of the land offices saddled upon the Treasury, which this proposition would do, but we have too keen an appreciation of the value both to the Government and the settler of the services of receivers to be willing to dispense with them, even to the pecuniary advantage of the reclamation fund.

But the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] reminds me, rather chidingly, that the reclamation fund belongs to the people of the United States, though we are now using it in the West, and so I will discuss the matter from the standpoint of economy, as though whatever saving there might be would in the end amount to the same thing whether saved to the fund or the Treasury direct.

The Commissioner of the General Land Office, in his report for 1905, recommends that the office of receiver of public moneys for United States land offices be abolished, and he states that a quarter of a million of dollars would annually be saved to the Government thereby. The Commissioner bases his estimate of alleged saving on the fact that the total compensation of the 117 receivers last year was \$285,000, and if these offices could be abolished without incurring any additional expenditures the saving would, of course, be the amount of the salary now paid. The Commissioner gives it as his opinion that the only additional assistance that would be required by the abolishment of the office of receiver would be one clerk at \$1,000 a year in each of the twenty-five land offices, where no clerks are now employed. This would entail an expense of \$25,000, and, subtracting that from \$275,000, the estimated amount which would be paid to receivers the coming year under the law as it now stands, the Commissioner arrives at his estimate of \$250,000 as the amount that would be saved by the abolition of this office.

It is my opinion that the question of cost of maintaining the office of receiver of public moneys is by no means the most important matter for consideration in this connection, for the receivers do perform very important and valuable services to the Government and entrymen; but looking at the matter from the standpoint of economy alone I am unable to agree with the Commissioner's estimate of the saving that would result if the office were abolished.

The fact is that the saving could by no possibility amount to the full sum of the compensation of the receiver, even if no additional clerks were required. The amount saved in salaries in all cases where the compensation of each officer is less than \$1,750 is only \$500, if no additional clerk is required. The reason for this is plain. The register and receiver receive, first, a salary of \$500 each, and above this commissions shared jointly until the maximum compensation of \$3,000 each is reached. The proposed amendment abolishing the office of receiver provides that the register shall receive fees in like amounts with the fees now paid to both register and receiver up to the maximum compensation, so that the register would, if the office of receiver were abolished, receive the fees now going to both up to the maximum allowance of \$2,500 in fees and \$500 in salary, case wherever the total compensation of receivers is less than \$2,500 they would all go to the register, and this would be the case wherever the total compensation of receivers is less than \$1,750, or \$500 salary and \$1,250 fees.

The report of the Commissioner shows that there were twenty-one offices where the compensation of the receiver was less than \$1,750 last year. The saving in these offices by doing away with the receivers would be twenty-one times \$500, or \$10,500 if no additional clerks were employed. As the Commissioner, however, contemplates the appointment of a \$1,000 clerk at each of these offices, there would be, as a matter of fact, an added expenditure of \$10,500 in these twenty-one offices instead of a gain of that amount. The Commissioner, however, evidently estimates a saving in these offices of the total amount of present compensation of the receivers, and this in the twenty-one offices above referred to amounted last year to \$26,367.71. If from this estimated saving we subtracted \$10,500, the actual saving in this item (doubly offset, however, by the

salary of extra clerks), we have here the sum of \$15,867.71 to be subtracted from the Commissioner's estimate of saving.

Nor is this all by any means, for the saving in the offices where the receiver receives between \$1,750 and \$3,000 would be by no means the full amount of the compensation of the receivers, not to mention the sums necessary for additional clerks. In offices of this class the saving, if no additional clerks were required, would be the difference between the amount of total joint compensation of both registers and receivers and the sum of \$3,000, the maximum salary; for wherever the register and receiver are receiving less than the maximum the abolition of one officer would give the other officer the maximum compensation.

There are thirty-nine offices where the compensation of each officer was above \$1,750 and below the maximum last year. The total compensation of receivers in these thirty-nine offices last year was \$90,637.61, and this is evidently the amount the Commissioner estimates is to be saved. As a matter of fact, however, if no additional clerk were required after the receiver was dismissed, the saving would only be the sum of the amounts which the combined compensation in each office exceeded \$3,000. I find the combined compensation of registers and receivers in these thirty-nine offices last year was \$181,347.22. If the bill recommended by the Commissioner abolishing the office of receiver passed, the registers in all of these offices would receive the maximum compensation of \$3,000 each, or \$117,000 in all. The saving, if no additional clerks were required, would therefore be \$181,347.22 less \$117,000, or \$64,347.22, and not \$90,637.61, the compensation of receivers.

From the above it will be seen that we must again revise the Commissioner's figures by further reducing the estimated amount of saving by the difference between the amount of saving he estimates in the class of cases above cited (the amount of compensation of receivers), \$90,637.61, and the actual amount under the terms of his proposed bill, \$64,347.22, the difference being \$26,290.39. Add this excess to the excess in the first class of cases and we have the sum of \$42,159.10 to deduct from the Commissioner's estimate of saving, leaving it \$207,840.90.

But this is not all by any means. The Commissioner estimates that clerks will be required in all offices where there are none now, and I have pointed out to you that to furnish these clerks at even \$1,000 a year will entail an extra expense of over \$10,000 above the present cost of running these offices.

If clerks are needed, in the opinion of the Commissioner, in the offices where the compensation is now small and therefore the business light, how much more will they be needed if the offices where the receiver now gets from \$1,750 to \$3,000 per annum? Is it not a rather violent assumption that fifty-four officers that now receive \$3,000 each, that pass daily on many important questions and handle vast sums of money, can be dispensed with and no provision whatever made for anyone to take their places and perform their duties? My opinion is that there would have to be and would be within a year a chief clerk in every one of these land offices, and that in all the larger offices this clerk would receive \$1,500 per year.

Remember, these clerks would, under the terms of the pending bill, be bonded officers of the Government, clothed with judicial powers in cases which often involve property worth tens of thousands of dollars and in the aggregate many millions; in many cases practically all of the property of a citizen. Many clerks in land offices now receive \$1,200 a year, and as these clerks would be the chief clerks and clothed with judicial authority, they would undoubtedly receive at least \$1,500 each.

There are 117 land offices. The Commissioner has estimated that 25 of the smallest and least important of these offices would require \$1,000 clerks. Surely the remaining 92 will require \$1,500 chief clerks, if we dispense with receivers now receiving from \$1,750 to \$3,000. This would involve a further expense of \$138,000 per annum, still further reducing the Commissioner's estimate by this amount and leaving the net saving not \$250,000, but possibly \$69,840.90, probably less.

But the question as to the possible saving by the abolishment of the office of receiver is comparatively unimportant when considered in connection with the importance of the policy involved. The proposition is simply one of dispensing with the services of 117 officials, appointed by the President from among the body of the people, of men who are conversant with conditions in the public-land States, and who have had in the majority of cases considerable experience with the workings of the public-land laws, and are qualified to weigh intelligently in proofs and contests the evidence presented from the standpoint of the law, as well as of equity and good faith, which must so largely control in the settlement of public-land ques-

tions, and to substitute for them civil-service clerks, possibly at a somewhat lessened cost, who, by reason of the character of their preparation and training, can not possibly have the knowledge or experience necessary to qualify them to pass justly and equitably on questions arising between claimants or between a claimant and the Government.

It is not only a movement in the direction of further centralization, but in the direction of still further minimizing the opportunity of the settler to secure a fair statement of the basis of his claims in the first instance, thereby increasing the necessity for expensive appeal.

The assumption that the work now performed by every receiver receiving above \$1,750 a year can be performed by the register and the clerks without additional help is not, in my opinion, justified by the facts. If, as a matter of fact, there are receivers who are not performing valuable services who hold their places as the sinecure which the Commissioner seems to consider them, it is, it occurs to me, the duty of the Interior Department to demand of such officers that they resign and make way for those who will perform faithfully and diligently the duties incumbent upon them, rather than make the possible shortcomings of a few the basis of a virtual indictment of all of these officers.

That receivers of the land office generally are rendering most efficient, valuable, and faithful service, both to the Government and the settler, which can not possibly be equally well performed either in the interests of the Government or the settler, and particularly the latter, by the average civil-service clerk, no matter what salary he received, I am in a position to testify from personal knowledge.

I am of the opinion that it might be in the interest of good service to provide that wherever the compensation of a receiver falls below \$1,500 per annum for two consecutive years, the office shall be abolished, and the duties performed by the register. This would not be a measure of economy, but would insure offices where the business is light having one officer who received enough to pay a good man to give all his time and attention to it.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the committee to a few facts about this matter which came, in part at least, to the attention of the members of the Committee on Public Lands. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]—who, by the way, has receivers in his State drawing \$14,479 as salaries, according to the official figures furnished by the Land Office, which I have in my hand—is opposed to this. Now, gentlemen, the Land Office has repeatedly recommended the abolition of these offices; and one of the reasons, gentlemen, why they are perpetually recommending this is because the duties of the receiver and the duties of the register are practically identical, and this report in substance says so. The report of the Land Office complains that, the duties of the two men being the same, they are constantly clashing, reversing each other's orders and opinions, to the public detriment. The office is an old one—established in 1800—and the reasons for it have disappeared, and the Department says that it is unnecessary now, besides being a great expense to the public, to the amount of \$285,835.32 per year.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I do.

Mr. RUCKER. I understood the gentleman to say a moment ago the Commissioner was perpetually recommending the abolition of these offices.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I so understand.

Mr. RUCKER. Are you advised about it?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I think I am.

Mr. RUCKER. I understand to the contrary.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I will ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] if the Department has not recommended repeatedly the abolition of these offices?

Mr. LACEY. I would say the word "repeatedly" would not perhaps apply.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Well, all right. It has been recommended in his last report, from which I shall read:

Mr. TAWNEY. If the gentleman from Tennessee will turn to page 416 of the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations, he will there find the testimony of the Commissioner of the Land Office in favor of the abolition of these offices.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Of course, and here is his recent report I have in my hand. Here, gentlemen, are the very words and many reasons of the Department for abolishing this office.

I read one—

That the necessity, for the reasons just stated, no longer exists.

The reasons for having the receiver no longer exist.

Listen to this:

It is now firmly established that the office is one, while its body is dual. A vacancy in either office disqualifies the remaining incumbent for the performance of the duties of his own office.

It is believed that existing conditions are such as to warrant and suggest the abolition of the office of the receiver, and the vesting in the register of the functions now performed by the receiver, for the following reasons:

I. The volume of work now transacted and receipts of money at many, if not all, of the local offices is not such as to require the services of both officers.

II. The existence of the dual responsibility is the occasion of frequent and chronic disagreement between the register and receiver, to the consequent prejudice of the local office, its conduct, and all who are affected thereby. Each charges the other with responsibility for any neglect or misfeasance which may be found to exist therein.

III. The convenience of frequent access to and inspection of the local offices is now such as to enable this office to keep itself at all times reasonably informed of the method and efficiency of their conduct, as it could not do in former times, owing to the lack of railroads and telegraphic communication between this office and many of its subordinate officials and the absence of the thorough and efficient system of frequent inspection now in force.

And so on.

Now, then, in another part of this report you will find that the Department states what the law is, Mr. Chairman, and charges a duplication of work by the receiver and register, their duties being practically the same.

By the act of May 24, 1824, the register and the receiver, or either of them, might administer an oath.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Just a moment, for a question.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman consider having a jury of twelve men to pass upon important questions a duplication of work?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I am for a jury of twelve men every time I can get it, but two men are not twelve. The parties can finally appeal to a jury of the country in these cases. If not, they should have the right. There is no jury before a register or a receiver.

Mr. MONDELL. They are the jury and the judge.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The report says:

By the act of May 29, 1830, proof of settlement and improvement should be made to the satisfaction of the register and receiver.

It must be to the satisfaction of both of the officers. Now, the officials here say that that is not necessary; that these two officers are constantly clashing, and the Commissioner wants one man responsible for the work and to pay one salary for what two men are certainly doing.

Mr. MONDELL rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Wyoming?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I decline to yield. The report further says:

By the act of June 1, 1840, a preemptor was required to make satisfactory proof of his or her residence before the register and receiver.

They have to make their proof before both of these officers. The Department says that is not necessary and causes a clash of authority.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has had ten minutes. I do not want to take up the time of the House further than to explain the law and answer the gentleman's speech. This report says:

At the present time the following duplicate records are kept in all local land offices, viz: Register of mineral receipts; register of homestead receipts; register of final homestead receipts; register of final receipts, desert lands; register of cash receipts, in which is also kept account of coal-land receipts; homestead contest docket.

The apparent reason for keeping these duplicate sets of records is for the purpose of having one officer a check upon the other. But disqualifies the other, and results in practically closing the office, a condition which often occurs.

I am showing you, gentlemen of the House, where there is an actual duplication in the law of the work of these two officers, where there is an actual duplication, in fact, which causes a clash of authority.

Mr. MONDELL. Now will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I decline to yield, Mr. Chairman; I want to hurry through. The gentleman knows I do not want to be discourteous. The report further says:

By the act of September 4, 1841, questions as to the right of preemption arising between different settlers were to be settled by the register and receiver, subject to appeal and revision of the Secretary of the Treasury, which appellate jurisdiction was transferred to the Land Office by section 10 of the act of June 12, 1858.

This report says the office is one, but dual.

Now, then, gentlemen, the Department, as I have tried to say, though interruptedly and disconnectedly, wants to do away with having two men performing the same work, passing on the same case, clashing in authority, reversing each other, and doing duplicate work, all of which the register can do. They both re-

ceive large salaries. As I have stated, there were \$14,000 paid in the State of Wyoming alone for the receiver, and yet the receiver gets his compensation for doing practically the same work, work which the Department says the register can do. Now, let us get to the amount of money that has been paid to these receivers, as set out in this recent report.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Now, the following table will show. It is admitted that the abolition of the office of register and receiver of public money will result in the saving to the Government of over \$250,000 per annum. The following table will show the compensation which has been paid to the several registers of public money in the years named:

Fiscal year ended June 30—

1901	\$292,480.56
1902	300,757.38
1903	296,803.79
1904	295,339.32
1905	285,835.22

Total for the past five years..... 1,471,216.57

Now, gentlemen, we have been unable to get this matter before the House on its merits. I voted in committee to bring this measure before the House, and I am ready now to strike down this unnecessary duplication of officers, this cause for unnecessary clash of the authority of public officers, and save this money to the Treasury of the Government, and for the betterment of other people in other matters more important than are two officers to do the same work, one of whom is entirely unnecessary.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a word, and then move to close debate.

Mr. RUCKER. I have been recognized. I only want a minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. TAWNEY. If the gentleman only wants a minute I will yield to him after a while.

This matter was considered by the committee very thoroughly. The Commissioner of the General Land Office appeared before the committee and went into the history of the creation of this office, defined the duties, and gave us a detailed statement of the number of officers, clerks, and compensation that they were receiving. The committee is of the opinion that this work can be done as effectively, if not more efficiently, than it is now done under these two officials, and to abolish the office of the receiver will save to the Government \$250,000 a year. A point of order would have been made if this had been carried in the bill, and for that reason the committee did not report a provision abolishing these offices.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa accomplishes nothing, if adopted, even if the Senate should agree to it. The receivers will continue to perform their duties as they are now performing them, because it is a statutory office, and not created by a regulation of the Secretary of the Interior. The two offices are interdependent, their jurisdiction is coequal, so that they must necessarily under the law continue to serve as they are now serving.

In case the appropriation is not provided now for their salaries in the next session of Congress we will be compelled to report on the deficiency bill the amount necessary to cover their salaries, or the receivers could go to the Court of Claims and obtain judgment for their salaries. If the gentleman from Iowa has an idea that this legislation can be inserted in the Senate, it could be done just as easily with this provision in as with it out. Therefore I do not think anything can be gained by the adoption of the amendment. I now move to close debate in two minutes, and ask that those two minutes be given to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. FORDNEY. I should like to have a few minutes.

Mr. TAWNEY. I will make it five minutes, to be divided equally between the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Missouri.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota moves that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be closed in five minutes, the time being equally divided between the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I will only use about two

minutes, and during that time I want to say I appreciate the fact that this is an important question, one that ought not to be dealt with here under the five-minute rule. It is a subject upon which a great deal may be said on the one side and the other, but looking at these things as they are, I am surprised that gentlemen will permit themselves to be lashed into a fury and that good lawyers, able men, the most studious Members of this House, will reach entirely wrong conclusions as to the merits of the issue involved. I want to say to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES], as I understand him, that he is entirely in error as to the facts which are involved in this controversy. There is no duplication of work so far as receivers and registers are concerned. Mr. Chairman, I think it is unnecessary for this House to act heroically, as suggested by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY], in order to protect the Government against the profligate use of money at the other end of the Capitol. I have heard a great deal charged against the other branch of the legislative department of government, but this is the first time a distinguished Member of this House has taken the position that it is necessary for us to pursue this unusual course and strike out this appropriation for these officers in order to protect the country against reckless profligacy. I think this matter should be brought before the House in the usual way and full time allowed for discussion. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, a bill has been introduced and has been before the committee the entire session which provides for the abolition of all the receivers of all the land offices in the United States. The claim has been set up that if the office of receiver were abolished it would effect a saving to the Government of \$250,000 a year; but there has not been one scintilla of evidence presented to the committee showing that it would save one cent to the Government. There is another provision in the bill, providing that clerks may be appointed by the President to fill the offices now occupied by the receivers, such clerks to be selected from the civil-service list. There is nothing to show how many clerks must be appointed to do the work now done by the receivers. There is nothing to show that there would be one single cent saved by the change. The registers and receivers decide all cases where there are contests in land cases, and that has been considered for many years a valuable service, because you are getting the decision of two men instead of one. One is a check upon the other. The receiver handles the money paid into the land office; the register does other work.

I am opposed, Mr. Chairman, to the abolition of the receivers and appointing in their place of clerks, because there is not a land office in the United States to-day that is up to date in the work. I know of land offices in the United States that are two years behind in their work at the present time, due to the men making entries under homestead entries, timber culture, and scrip lands, and every other kind of entry—they are two years behind in their work on account of the lack of sufficient force of clerks in the offices.

If the chairman of the committee could show that one penny can be saved by the abolishing of the receivers, I would give more favorable consideration to the matter; but nothing along those lines has been done. I know of a receiver appointed in a certain land office from Alabama, who held in his hands money paid him by entrymen for two years before sending it to the Government, and not issuing one single receiver's receipt during that whole time, and it was found out that he had this money loaned out at a very high rate of interest for his own benefit. Do you want to appoint clerks from Alabama, under civil-service rules, to do the work in land offices in Alaska or some other distant part of the country? The place from which to choose these officers is the district in which the land offices are located. I am opposed to the proposition, and, gentlemen, there is not a receiver in my district.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Debate on the pending amendment is exhausted. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa to strike out.

The question being taken, the motion of Mr. LACEY was rejected.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I now call up the provision on page 73, the items under the general head of the Geological Survey.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota, chairman of the committee, calls up the items for the United States Geological Survey, on page 73.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, on the subject of registers and receivers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unan-

imous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For general expenses of the Geological Survey: For the geological survey and the classification of the public lands and examination of the geological structure, mineral resources, and the products of the national domain, to continue the preparation of a geological map of the United States, gauging streams, and determining the water supply, and for surveying forest reserves, including the pay of necessary clerical and scientific force and other employees in the field and in the office at Washington, D. C., and all other absolutely necessary expenses, including telegrams, furniture, stationery, telephones, and all other necessary articles required in the field to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, namely:

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a point of order against a portion of the paragraph just read, that portion beginning on line 7, page 75, after the word "domain," including all of lines 8 and 9, on the ground that it changes existing law and that there is no authority in law for the provision.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana makes a point of order.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I should like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota, in charge of this bill, if he has a copy of the original law providing for the Geological Survey?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should like to ask the gentleman from Indiana to state his point of order again.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The point of order includes all in line 7, after the word "domain," and lines 8 and 9, the words against which I make the point of order being:

To continue the preparation of a geological map of the United States, gauging streams, and determining the water supply.

The point is that it changes existing law. There is no authority of law for appropriations for any such purposes as those mentioned in the sentence to which the point of order is directed.

Mr. TAWNEY. What did the gentleman from Indiana ask me?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I wanted to know if the gentleman had the original law providing for the Geological Survey?

Mr. TAWNEY. There is a summary there which gives the titles—1879, I think, is the year to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes; 1879. The original statute authorized the Geological Survey, under the Interior Department, to have the direction of the geological survey and the classification of the public lands, an examination of the geological structure, mineral resources, and products of the national domain; that the Director shall have no personal or private interest, etc.; but the authorization of the work of the Geological Survey originally was confined to public lands, or the national domain.

I think this is one of the best illustrations of the evolution of departmental service, the gradual and insidious expansion of the powers and functions of the divisions and the bureaus in the various Departments of the Government.

Mr. KEIFER. I should like to ask the gentleman whether his attention has been called to the act of August, 1882, with reference to the authority of the Geological Survey to make preparation for a geological map?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Not directly, but incidentally; and I have before me a precedent made in the Forty-seventh Congress, of which the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER] was Speaker—although he was not in the chair and did not decide the question—a decision on the geological map proposition, rendered by Mr. Kasson, of Iowa, on a point of order made by Mr. Hiscock, of New York, on the identical proposition providing for a geological map of the United States. The point of order was sustained because the authorization was not confined to a geological map of the national domain, the only authority that the Geological Survey had to deal with it under the law calling it into existence. There is no authority in law for the Geological Survey to make a map of the United States or to gauge streams or water courses anywhere, excepting in the national domain, and in the sense of this law the term "national domain" has been construed to mean territory or land which the Federal Government owns or over which it has control.

Mr. DALZELL. Does the gentleman from Indiana contend that the words "national domain" and "public land" mean the same thing?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. For the purpose of this law I think they do.

Mr. DALZELL. I think for the purposes of this law they do not. National domain means that territory over which the nation possesses sovereignty.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I understand this law has been so interpreted that the Geological Survey prosecutes its work all

over the country; it makes topographical surveys of counties and cities where the General Government has not a single dollar's worth of property or a foot of land; where there isn't a square rod of navigable water; that it prosecutes its work, gauging streams all over the country where there can be no possible Federal interests, without any regard to the question of navigation, but with a view of ascertaining power for private use. There is no law authorizing the Geological Survey to gauge streams or to make maps of the United States.

Mr. SMITH of California. I am not certain that I understand the full scope of the gentleman's proposed amendment. Would that cut out the matter of the gauging of streams entirely in the United States?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. No.

Mr. SMITH of California. It is now carried on in connection with the Reclamation Service.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Stream gauging in connection with the Reclamation Service is a separate and distinct service.

Mr. SMITH of California. But suppose they are carrying on the gauging of streams where the reclamation project has not yet been put forward?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. This would not affect it if the stream gauging was within the public domain of the United States.

Mr. SMITH of California. Suppose they wanted to gauge the streams at a point where it crossed private property, but affected the result—that is, the result might affect the reclamation project.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. If the gauging happened to be on private property, but showed the flow over the public domain, it would be permissible even it was outside the Reclamation Service.

Mr. SMITH of California. If it crossed public lands, you couldn't make any distinction between the stream that flows across the public land or the private land. It might be partly on private land and at last the stream flow onto the public land and still be available for reclamation purposes.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The point is not involved here on this point of order. The question is whether there is authority of law for the Geological Survey to gauge streams anywhere. There is no authority for it to gauge streams on public domain, because that is not enumerated among the powers and duties of the Bureau in any law bearing upon its powers and duties.

Mr. DAVIDSON. I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana a question.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Does the gentleman contend that the Geological Survey Bureau would have no authority to make a geological map of any portion of the United States except of land owned by the Government; and if so, would that map grow less annually as the public land was taken off and occupied by homesteaders?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I think it would have no authority to make a general map of the United States like the one displayed now before the committee. Congress has authority to confer that power on the Geological Survey, but Congress has never done it.

Mr. DAVIDSON. I understand your point is that the only power Congress has ever given is to make a map of the public domain owned by the Government.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Congress has not done that, and it was held by former Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House that as incident to the work—the work described in the original law, the law creating this Bureau—that perhaps it might make maps and charts of the work it has done on the public domain. Now I want to cite to the Chair a case directly in point on the map question.

Mr. OLMSTED. Before the gentleman goes on to that I want to say that I notice that in the act of 1879, to which the gentleman has referred, it is provided that this officer—the Director of the Geological Survey—shall have direction of the Geological Survey and classification of "public lands;" also the examination of the geological structure, mineral resources, and production of the "national domain." Now does not "public lands" mean one thing and "national domain" mean something far more extensive?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I think not; I think the authors of the law had some regard to the rules of rhetoric, and in using the words "public land" in one place and "national domain" in another, he did it to avoid tautology.

Mr. OLMSTED. Well, but he has used them both again, I will call to the attention of the gentleman, in a further paragraph providing for the expense of the Geological Survey in the classification of "public lands," and then further on for the "examination of the geological structural mineral resources and products of the national domain," seeming to my mind to

make the term "national domain" mean something broader than the term "public lands."

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Even if that is all true, there is no authority for the gauging of streams, and there is no authority for the making of United States maps, and that is the particular point to which the question of order is directed.

Mr. OLMSTED. If the United States is part of the national domain, then it would seem to me that there is authority for making a map of it.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I want to read some law upon that question.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me to offer him a suggestion?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield for a suggestion.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Is it not a fact that owing to the law providing for the sale of the public lands, some at \$10 an acre, some at \$5 an acre, some at \$2.50 an acre, some at \$1.25 an acre, according to whether the land is mineral, stone, coal, or agricultural land, this provision is with reference to the classification of public lands, and that was better English than it would have been to use the expression "the classification of the public domain?"

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. And that it was because of the use of the word "classification" that the term "public lands" was used in connection therewith, rather than "national domain?"

Mr. DALZELL. The gentleman claims that the meaning of words is to be determined by the sense of rhetoric of the people who use them and not by their plain and evident meaning.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. We always construe language in the connection in which it is used.

Mr. SHERLEY rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield for a question.

Mr. SHERLEY. I want to ask the gentleman if he noticed that in the act creating the Geological Survey the act which had authorized the geographical and geological survey of the Rocky Mountain region was done away with and embraced within this, as was the act for the survey of the Territories? If the gentleman's construction is true, you make this act narrower than the acts which created particular bureaus that are embraced within this act, because the Rocky Mountain region that was to be surveyed under the former act included not only land of the public domain in the sense of belonging to the Government, but also land within the States.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I beg the gentleman's pardon; but what statute does the gentleman say included private lands?

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will look at the statute which creates the Geological Survey, he will find the words "and the geological and geographical survey of the Territories and the geographical and geological survey of the Rocky Mountain region." Now, the Rocky Mountain region, which has been provided for in the previous act, embraced not only the lands belonging to the Government, but embraces parts of the States.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. And that is included within the act creating the Geological Survey.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The probabilities are if it were necessary to interpret that statute in connection with the present point of order it would be so limited as to include only the national domain in the Rocky Mountain region. It is not likely, or I mean to say it would not be proper, to presume that the Geological Survey was authorized, a Federal administrative agency, to do things that were in no sense Federal functions, that in no sense belonged to the Federal Government; and when the law provides a survey of national domain, a classification of public lands, we, of course, must infer from that that it means public lands and national domain under the control of the Federal Government, because it is a Federal agency and not a local or State agency; and the very purpose of the creation of the Geological Survey was for the furnishing of information respecting public lands, with a view of their classification and sale. I believe that is the object of it.

Mr. SHERLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman this: When the authorization of the survey of the Rocky Mountain region was made, which was prior to this act, is it not a fact that at that time the work was done irrespective of whether it was public lands owned by the United States or not? Didn't it embrace the entire Rocky Mountain region?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I am not able to answer that question, but it does not have any significance in the consideration of this question. The question is, What authority has the statute conferred upon the Geological Survey? That is the sole and only question; not what it has done, not what it had

done before, but what it has authority to do, and when we settle that question we have determined then whether this provision is in order.

I desire to submit this decision which I have been talking about for some minutes. In the Forty-seventh Congress, in July, 1882, when the sundry civil bill was under consideration, Mr. Kasson, of Iowa, was in the chair, and this identical provision, or part of it, was in the bill and was read. It was in the bill in these words:

And to continue the preparation of a geological map of the United States.

Now, compare that with the language in this bill:

To continue the preparation of a geological map of the United States.

The identical language was contained in that bill that is in the present bill, and is involved or included in the portion of the paragraph to which the point of order is made. Mr. Hiscock made the point of order that there was no authority for the Geological Survey to make a geological map of the United States, and it was discussed by him and Mr. Adkins, of Tennessee, and others, and the Chairman in ruling upon the question said:

The Chair will rule upon the point of order. The case to which attention has been called, and on which a rule has been heretofore made, was with reference to the Geodetic Survey and its authority to proceed to the execution of that work for several miles from the coast—

That was another decision cited to the Chair, and which he distinguished—

Now, it is known to every gentleman here that the work of the Coast Survey embraces necessarily a considerable distance from the coast for scientific purposes, and therefore the Chair ruled that to be in order, as it was within the jurisdiction and in accordance with precedents. On this, however, the question presented is an entirely different one. This section of the bill provides for the geological survey and the classification of the public lands, an examination of the geological structure, mineral resources, and products of the national domain, and is limited to that. Under that language the survey can only be prosecuted upon the national domain. But the proposition of the gentleman from Tennessee here is to continue the preparation of a geological map of the United States. Now, if the words "public domain" were added, the Chair would regard it as following the precedents and within the line of the work which they have been doing by maps and diagrams. But the Chair is of opinion that to continue the preparation of a geological map of the United States would largely increase the functions of this survey and extend it beyond what is contemplated within the boundaries of the State and not warranted by law. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Now, it is not claimed, Mr. Chairman, that there is any authority of law anywhere for the Geological Survey to gauge streams, to determine a water supply, outside, perhaps, of the Reclamation Service, and this provision authorizes the Geological Survey to make a geological map of the United States, gauge streams, and determine the water supply throughout the entire United States. That is the interpretation and that is the practice, because the hearings show that the Geological Survey is engaged in the business of gauging streams all over the country in the old States, in the New England States, the Southern States, the Middle States, and Western States. It does gauge streams everywhere, except, I believe, upon the national domain, the only place it might have any possible show of authority to do that work.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will.

Mr. DAVIDSON. What would the gentleman say to the proposition that under the head of mineral resources and products of the national domain the Geological Survey would have authority to determine whether there were underground currents of water flowing in different sections, and of the products of the national domain as to whether the water power of the flowing streams on the domain were—

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Oh, I would readily say that is all fanciful; there is no basis for any such authority as that; to determine whether there may be minerals in the bed of a stream it is not necessary to gauge the stream or measure the water supply, and the water supply does not apply to the class of investigations or researches that the original law authorized.

Mr. OLMSTED. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield.

Mr. OLMSTED. I notice that the words against which the point of order is made are "to continue the preparation," etc.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. OLMSTED. It is a fact, I believe, that appropriations have been made from year to year and the work is in progress.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. OLMSTED. I desire to know what the gentleman from Indiana says as to that branch of the rule invoked which expressly excepts Government works in progress?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Well, now, this is identically the same language that was contained in the provision which was held

out of order in the Forty-seventh Congress, "to continue preparation of geological maps of the United States;" but another sufficient argument to that is decisions hold that the work must be a tangible object—something in the nature of a structure—that that sort of work which is in a sense abstruse or like scientific research or investigation and the preparation of results is not a public work or object coming within the sense of the rules of the House.

Mr. DALZELL. What has the gentleman to say to the decision made at this session, acquiesced in by the House, that the continuation of a list of claims was a continuation of a public work already in progress? There is nothing very tangible or very structural about that?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It is in a sense structural, but that is a particular thing. Now, the gauging of streams applies to thousands of streams, all the streams in the country.

Mr. DALZELL. This applies to a thousand claims.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. If it were for the gauging of the Mississippi River, for instance, and we had progressed to a certain extent upon that work, and the proposition was to continue the particular work that we had already entered upon, there would be some force in the argument of the gentleman. We authorized by resolution the Commission to prepare a publication covering the particular subject of a list of claims, and that publication was in process of preparation. The Commission had it partly completed and it was held in order to make an appropriation to complete it. I do not remember whether the question of order was raised respecting that appropriation or not, but it was simply to complete that particular specific work that had been already authorized—we had authorized it by resolution. I do not think, when I come to reflect, that instance is in point at all, because that work was authorized. It was not simply authorized by an appropriation; it was authorized by a resolution, and therefore, of course, was all in order. I think, Mr. Chairman, there can be no doubt that these items are not authorized by law. They are not public works or objects in progress within the meaning of the rule, and they should go out.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to understand exactly what the question made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] is. As I understand—and he will correct me if I am wrong—his point of order is made against these words, commencing on page 75 of the bill, "To continue the preparation of a geological map of the United States, gauging streams, and determining the water supply." I understand that is the extent of the point of order.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think for the purpose of determining the point of order you are conclusively bound to assume that the Committee on Appropriations used this language with a full knowledge of the subject, and when they said, "To continue the preparation of a geological map of the United States," and so forth, they were stating exactly the condition of things. We have in view, before us, of the Members here a geological map of the United States, largely prepared by the Geological Survey. The law in the past authorized the Geological Survey to prepare a map, and it is one of those things that can not be finished in a short time. There will be no completion of such a map so long as the Geological Survey is engaged in its work, and so long as it is necessary to be so engaged it is probable that it will be engaged in the preparation of a geological map. It will hardly ever be completed.

Now, the law of 1879 has been read, and we seem to be sticking on the question as to whether the words used in this act, namely, "national domain," include all of the United States territory. We seem to be troubled about that, but I am not now called on, I think, to undertake to state why in a part of the same clause of the act of 1879 there were used the words "public land" and then "national domain." But let us move up a little closer to the real question made here by the point of order and come to the act of August 7, 1882, which contains a clause on the subject of the Geological Survey, and let me here at the same time dispose of the gentleman's point of order that he claims was made in the Forty-seventh Congress, when he says a decision was made favorable to his point of order made now. That decision was made when we were considering the sundry civil bill, in the month of July, 1882. It is said that the point of order was sustained by ruling out the language "to continue the preparation of a geological map of the United States." The point of order was sustained against that language in the then sundry civil bill. Whatever may have been the ruling in July, 1882, the bill became a law on August 7, 1882, a month later, and it contained exactly that language and provided for a geological map of the United States. So we are not now dealing with the question of the meaning of the words

"public domain" or "national domain," because we entered upon the work of making maps by law under the act of August 7, 1882, and yearly since.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me read the clause of that act. I read from page 329 of the Statutes, volume 22, as follows:

For the United States Geological Survey and the classification of public lands and examination of the geological structure, mineral resources, and products of the national domain, and to continue the preparation of a geological map of the *United States*.

Is there any doubt about whether that covers the whole of the domain of the United States?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. KEIFER. Certainly.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Has the gentleman made sufficient investigation of the history of that provision to know whether or not, after it was ruled out on a point of order in the House, it was inserted in the Senate and became a part of the bill?

Mr. KEIFER. That is a matter that I can not now answer, but I know it is a part of the law of 1882, and it has been a part of the law enacted each year ever since. It has been reenacted over and over every year, and the geological map that we see before us is a product of that sort of legislation, and therefore I was right in saying that the Committee on Appropriations fully understood what they were doing when they used the language here used, which is sought to be struck out, namely, "to continue the preparation of a geological map of the United States."

Mr. TAWNEY. I want to correct one statement made by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KEIFER. Well?

Mr. TAWNEY. That is a map of the United States, not a geological map.

Mr. KEIFER. Partly a geological map, and is so marked and so called.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Not at all.

Mr. TAWNEY. It is partly topographical, and shows where some geological surveys have been made.

Mr. KEIFER. It may not be complete, but there are geological markings, and it is so designated on the margin and lower right-hand corner.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. This map is not a topographical map and not a geological map.

Mr. KEIFER. The gentleman is in error. I am not talking about topography, but about a geological map.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It is a map of the United States on which is indicated where topographical and geological surveys have been made, but it is neither a topographical nor a geological map.

Mr. KEIFER. Nobody supposed that it was in a completed state, but it shows that the geology of the country is marked in a general way and in parts greatly in detail. Examine the map; it shows for itself.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Not at all.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman state any authority for the Bureau of the Geological Survey for the beginning of the work of a geological map other than what is found in the sundry civil appropriation bill, to which he referred?

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, I am not familiar enough with the earlier acts to state that there was an express provision in those acts requiring the Geological Survey to enter upon the making of a map, but I am prepared to say that the work of the Geological Survey would have been very worthless and useless if it had not done its work with a view to making a map. It was one of the necessary incidents of the work of the Survey that the Survey should enter upon the making of a geological map of the United States.

So, Mr. Chairman, in the act of 1882 and the acts since we have been providing for a continuation of the preparation of a geological map of the United States. That was the exact wording of the act of 1882 and of later acts, and it is quite immaterial what rule was made earlier than that, whatever the ruling was earlier than the passage of this act of August 7, 1882. I myself am of the opinion that in the use of the words "national domain" they meant the general domain of the United States. It will be impossible to have a geological survey of every piece of land by the side of land owned by individuals. Of course the original idea was to survey the public lands in the West to some extent, but it was meant to have a geological survey of all the country; and the language has been continued, and it has been recognized that a map, a Geological Survey map, was to be made, and we have been from year to year making appropriation to continue the making of a geological map of the United States, and the motion now is to strike out that part of the language that is simply the language used from year to year commencing with the year 1882.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, to sustain the gentleman's point of order it will be necessary for the Chair to hold that "public lands" and "national domain" are absolutely interchangeable terms.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman permit the Chair to ask a question.

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. Does not the gentleman believe that forest reserves are part of the public domain and not part of the public land?

Mr. DALZELL. That is in the line of my argument.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understood the gentleman, there was no distinction of public lands.

Mr. DALZELL. I say that the Chair, to sustain the point of order made by the gentleman from Indiana, will have to hold that "public lands" and the "national domain," as used in the organization of the Geological Survey, are identical terms. I say that it is perfectly evident that they are not identical.

Mr. TAWNEY. If the gentleman will permit me—I do not care to discuss the point of order, but I want to correct an impression that he and many Members seem to have in regard to the organization and jurisdiction of the Geological Survey. If he will permit me to make a statement in regard to the history of the Geological Survey—

Mr. DALZELL. I know the history.

Mr. TAWNEY. I want to make a statement. The Academy of Sciences reported, in obedience to a resolution passed by Congress, in favor of the organization, in which report they used the word "public domain."

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. When was that?

Mr. TAWNEY. That was in 1878. The resolution was passed by Congress. When the Academy of Sciences was incorporated Congress reserved the right to call upon it for a report on any special scientific subject. In 1878 Congress passed a resolution calling upon the Academy of Sciences for a report as to the best organization for the geological survey of the public domain. The Academy of Sciences accepted this service and made their report. In that report they spoke only of the "public domain" and defined it so that there can be no mistake as to what they intended the field of the activities of the Geological Survey to be. They clearly stated that the Survey should be limited to the public domain, and what they meant by the "public domain" was the Territories and the unsold public lands of the United States. It was upon this report that Congress authorized the organization of the Geological Survey and limited the field of its activities to the public domain. These scientific men did not contemplate or propose an organization that should include in its work a topographic and geological survey of the United States. As a matter of history I felt this statement should be made.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota has said what I intended to say, though I probably could not have said it in as clear a manner as he has; but I think it throws considerable light upon this question.

Prior to 1879 there was an inquiry made by the National Academy of Sciences as to the proper method to be pursued to bring about certain national results. The consequence of that inquiry was the passage of the act incorporating the Geological Survey, the act of March 3, 1879, and it is in these words:

For the salary of the Director of the Geological Survey, which office is hereby established under the Interior Department, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, \$6,000: *Provided*, That this officer shall have the direction of the Geological Survey, the classification of the public lands, and the examination of the geological structure, mineral resources, and products of the national domain.

The act goes on to say:

And the geological and geographical survey of the Territories and the geographical and geological survey of the Rocky Mountain region, under the Department of the Interior, and the geographical surveys west of the one hundredth meridian, under the War Department, are hereby discontinued, to take effect on the 30th day of June, 1879.

In other words, in addition to the specific authority contained in the sentence "classification of the public lands and examination," etc., there was an intention expressed as to all these varying subjects of national concern. The survey of these particular pieces of territory here and there was turned over to the Geological Survey, which was intrusted with the survey of the national domain. Now, what is the national domain? Why, the national domain, according to all the dictionaries that I have been able to consult, consists of the territory under the jurisdiction of the sovereign. The national domain of the United States consists of the forty-five States and the Territories of Alaska, Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippine Islands. It is absolutely impossible to define the national domain in any other way.

But that is not all. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] contends that what the men who framed this act meant was this:

The classification of the public lands and the examination of their geological structure, mineral resources, and products.

That is what the gentleman says the parties who framed this piece of legislation meant to say, but that is not what they did say. They said that the Geological Survey should have charge of the classification of the public lands, but when it came to an examination of mineral resources and products, they said that they should be the mineral resources and products, not of the public lands, but of the national domain, the mineral resources and products of the entire country. Why, suppose that the Geological Survey was engaged in the investigation of the mineral resources and products of a little piece of the Territory of Arizona, immediately joining the State of Texas. The moment they struck the State line, according to my friend from Indiana, the Geological Survey would cease to have any function to perform. The functions of the Geological Survey, if my friend from Indiana is correct, have already been performed; the public lands have been classified; the mineral resources and products of the public lands are not so varied that many of them yet remain to be examined. Now, it seems to me that it is absurd to say that the gentlemen who framed this legislation had in view not so much the expression of what they intended, but had in view the matter of rhetorical beauty. My friend from Indiana says they did not want to repeat the term "public lands," that it would have been redundant, and therefore they used in the second part of the sentence the words "national domain," but they meant only to say that the classification of the public lands and the examination of their geological structure, their mineral resources, and their products should be the function of this survey. On the contrary, as it seems to me, they designedly used the right speech in determining by the use of two different terms the two different meanings that they intended to insert in the legislation. The public lands are to be classified, but the mineral resources and the products of the national domain are to be examined by the Geological Survey. Now, I end just exactly as I began. The Chair, in order to sustain the point of order, must hold that in this legislation "public lands," and "national domain" are absolutely interchangeable terms. I do not think he ought to so hold.

Mr. OLMSTED. I wish to add just a word to what my colleague has so well said. In construing a statute we must consider all of its parts. Now, we note, first, on page 394, volume 20 of the Statutes at Large, that in the act of 1879, conferring certain powers upon the Director of the Geological Survey, Congress abolished certain other surveys which plainly did have reference to land not owned by the United States. But they differentiate between public lands in the sense of lands owned by the United States and the national domain, meaning the entire territory within the jurisdiction of the United States.

Now, if, as my friend from Indiana says, they intended merely a rhetorical flourish in using these terms, see how they might with less labor have got better results:

"For the Geological Survey and classification of public lands and examination of geological structure and mineral resources and products thereof" they would have said, if they referred to public lands only; but instead of that they say "national domain," clearly referring to something larger and more extensive than public lands. They would not have abolished the other departments of surveys had they not intended that this Geological Survey should have charge of these matters in the Territories, in the region of the Rocky Mountains, and west of the one hundredth meridian.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman if he thinks that under that authorization the United States Geological Survey would have the right to make a geological survey of the State of Pennsylvania as a part of the national domain?

Mr. OLMSTED. It has been doing it; that has been the construction.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is not answering the question. The mere fact that it has been done is not proof that it is authorized by law. The question is, Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania believe that under the authority conferred by the statute the Geological Survey would have the power to make a survey of the State of Pennsylvania?

Mr. OLMSTED. It is a well-established principle of construction that contemporaneous exposition is most powerful in law. In that very same year in which they framed this law they appropriated for just that purpose, and have been doing it every year for twenty-five years since. That leads me, Mr. Chairman, to the other branch of the subject which I desire to discuss. These words to which the point of order is made are,

"To continue the preparation of a geological map of the United States, gauging streams, and determining the water supply." It must be a conceded fact that this work has been going on for twenty-five years under annual appropriations from the Government, and that brings us to a consideration of the rule that is invoked against this paragraph, to the effect that there shall be no expenditure provided for in an appropriation bill not authorized by law, "unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress." It can not be disputed that this is a work already in progress. The gentleman from Indiana says it is not a tangible work. I never heard that such a work was intangible, and I am not going to stop to discuss it except to call the attention of the Chair to two decisions that bear on the point. The first is on page 348 of the Manual, at the bottom of the page:

An appropriation to continue the marking of a boundary line of the nation is in continuation of a public work.

That was decided in the last Congress—the second session of the Fifty-eighth Congress. The present distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations was in the chair.

Now, on the top of the next page it is recorded as having been held that "an appropriation to complete a list of claims was held to be in continuation of a public work or object." An appropriation had been made to make a list of private claims against the Government, and the list was being made. The further appropriation was asked for the completion or continuation of that list, and it was held to be in continuation of a public work or object in progress. Now, it seems to me that unless the Chair finds that these two rulings ought to be reversed, it will be compelled to overrule this point of order on the same grounds.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, the point made by the gentleman from Indiana, if it has any validity, results in this proposition: That the words "public domain" mean the same as "public lands."

Mr. DALZELL. If the gentleman from Kentucky will pardon me, the words in the statute are not "public domain;" they are "national domain."

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman is right. I should have said "national domain."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to call the attention of the gentleman from Kentucky to the latter portion of the same act creating the Geological Survey, in which it speaks of the codification of the present laws relating to the public domain. There the words used are "public domain."

Mr. SHERLEY. If the Chair will observe, there are three phrases used to express different things—"public land," "public domain," and "national domain." Now, the absolute inaccuracy of the contention of the gentleman from Indiana is shown by one little side light.

There is a provision that the Director of the Geological Survey shall not be interested in any of the lands surveyed. Now, if the lands were public lands only of the United States and the survey was limited to public lands of the United States, it would follow, as a matter of course, that he could not be interested in any of the lands that were surveyed, and it would be absurd and useless to put in the act the words that are put in, that the Director and members of the Geological Survey shall have no personal or private interests in the lands or mineral wealth of the region under survey. If it were public land they could not have.

Mr. TAWNEY. Why couldn't they have? They could make an entry.

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, unquestionably they could make an entry, but the moment they made the entry the land would cease in the true sense of the term to be the public domain of the country, and would belong to the man who had made the entry therein under the law of the United States. The Chair will notice another thing. The purpose of this act was to combine certain work that was being done by different departments under one head. There is nothing in the act to show that it was the intention of the framers of it to narrow the work to a smaller compass than existed under the particular heads that were already doing the work. Take the acts that are abolished by this. Take the act for the geological survey of the Rocky Mountain region. Is there anything in that language, has anything been pointed out by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] that would show that under the act providing for the survey of the Rocky Mountain region they were limited to surveying simply public lands within the Rocky Mountain region? Is there anything within the act authorizing the survey of lands beyond the one hundredth meridian that would indicate that it is confined to public lands only? Now, if it be true that the acts that this act supersedes are broad enough to include lands not belonging to the Government as

public lands, it follows that this act which intends to embrace them must also include things beyond. Then the Chair will bear in mind in construing this section that no construction which is against the common sense and purpose of an act is to be indulged in unless the plain language of the act requires it. The whole act and its purpose must be considered. It is manifest to any man who knows anything in regard to geological work, to topographical mapping, that it is practically impossible to do efficient work if you are to be confined within limited territory. As stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], if a survey had been started in the Territory of Arizona, and the work came to the boundary line of the State of California, under the narrow construction claimed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] that work would have to be stopped, even although by stopping it you would not be able to follow a single lead of any ore vein of copper, of silver, or of gold, or to make a real geological survey.

Mr. TAWNEY. Does the gentleman from Kentucky know that that is exactly what happens to-day under the construction of the Geological Survey?

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not know or admit it.

Mr. TAWNEY. Does the gentleman not know that unless California will cooperate with the Geological Survey in making a map the Geological Survey will not continue its work into that State?

Mr. SHERLEY. But the distinction is this: In the first place, the gentleman's facts are not correct. The cooperation with the States is given precedence because it enables the completion of the whole country at a quicker period than otherwise would happen, but the work contemplates the final doing of work all along over the whole country, and the gentleman will find from the reports of the Survey that they have never yet stopped right at the boundary of some particular section of a State line when it was necessary to go beyond. In my own State, in my own district, they are making a topographical survey now of the county of Jefferson, in the State of Kentucky, and because of the topography there, they are carrying that quarter section over into the State of Indiana in order to complete it, not confining it to State lines.

Mr. TAWNEY. But the State of Indiana is cooperating the same as the gentleman's State is.

Mr. SHERLEY. No; it is not cooperating the same as my State is. It may be cooperating in particular work, but the point is this: That the Geological Survey expects to map the whole country, and while they may do some particular work at some time and another particular work at another time, the act contemplates the doing of the whole of it. The construction claimed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] would limit them to a narrow strip of public domain, and the result would be that in any number of instances their work could not be completed, because their jurisdiction would end right at the point where it might be most necessary to continue it.

But, Mr. Chairman, without taking further time, I simply want to say this in conclusion, that the use of the term "national domain" is not accidental, because it occurs too often, and it occurs in juxtaposition to the use of the terms "public lands" and "public domain." There might be some plausibility lent to the argument, if, in the first section only did you find the term "national domain." It would be curious that men knowing how to use the English language should use that phrase to express the same thing as "public lands," when it does not express it to the popular mind or to any other mind, save that of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER]. But when you go further down, you find them again using the expression "national domain," having used just above it the expression "public lands," and this second repetition of these two phrases must carry conviction to any mind that they had in mind something other than public lands.

Mr. MARTIN. Will the Chair indulge me upon one point that has not been made?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN. Just for a moment. Now, in addition to what has been said as to the language of this act creating the Geological Survey, which refers to the classification of public lands, an examination of the geological structure, mineral resources, and products of the national domain, I want to call the attention of the Chair to what seems to me to be an additional authority in the act. The Director of the Geological Survey is also given authority to make a geological and geographical survey of the Territories and a geological and geographical survey of the Rocky Mountain region. I apprehend, of course, that the statute giving authority to the Director to make a geological survey of any region certainly gives him authority incidentally

to make a geological map of that region, because the work of the Geological Survey would be of little or no value unless it were placed in the form of a map, where it could be of public utility. Now, what is the Rocky Mountain region and what would be the making of a geological map of the Rocky Mountain region? Certainly it would not be confined to the public lands of the Rocky Mountains. The Rocky Mountain region is something greater than the Rocky Mountains themselves. It is in this instance all of that region lying west of the Missouri River and between that and the Pacific Ocean, and now, upon the admission of States, the Rocky Mountain region embraces many of the United States, notably Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, the Dakotas, Colorado, and others that might be mentioned. Now, the point that I make is that under the direct authorization—

The CHAIRMAN. May the Chair ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did the Rocky Mountain region embrace those States at the time or were they Territories?

Mr. MARTIN. Some were Territories and some were States at that time. Colorado was a State and Nevada was a State at the time the bill was passed, and there were other States in that region at that time. Some Territories have been admitted since, but this in no way impairs or affects the argument I seek to make upon this subject. There are now in the Rocky Mountain region additional States of the Union and have been since this language has been used repeatedly in these appropriation acts.

Now, then, the objection or point of order of the gentleman from Indiana is to an entire clause which provides a fund for the Director of the Geological Survey for continuing the making of a geological map of the United States. Undoubtedly, under the specific language to which I have referred, the Director of the Geological Survey has been amply authorized to make a geological survey at least within the Rocky Mountain region, and if to make a geological survey in the Rocky Mountain region to make a geological map of it. It will be presumed that in using any appropriation that will be made here it will not be applied to an unlawful purpose when a lawful purpose is carried in the legislation. The point I make, then, is simply this, that the point of order against this entire clause is not good, providing under this clause the Director can use this fund in any lawful way, and I insist that so far as that portion of the United States within the Rocky Mountain region is concerned this appropriation can be lawfully used to carry on the continuation of a work which is properly authorized within the act creating the Geological Survey.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I think this proposition has, to some extent, been decided heretofore. It is a well-known proposition of parliamentary law that where an appropriation for a specific purpose has been carried on in an appropriation bill from year to year it is held not to be a change of existing law. In the Forty-ninth Congress a point of order was made against what is known as the "fast mail service" going South, and there the Chairman held the provision was in order in the appropriation bill because it had been carried on from year to year for some fifteen years. Now, there is an exception to that rule. It has also been held that the reenactment from year to year of a law intended to apply during the year of its enactment only does not relieve the provision in reference to the point of order. Now, the Chair will note with that exception it has been held that provisions of law reenacted from year to year are to apply to that year only. Manifestly the proposition here is not to apply to the year only in which the appropriation is made. The survey of the public lands of the United States and the gauging of the rivers of the United States can not be done in one year. It must apply as a continuing proposition or the work would have no value whatever. Therefore I say that that exception can not apply to the provisions of this bill, but that it is a proposition on its face that contemplates the idea that it shall be considered from one year to another.

But, Mr. Chairman, on January 29, 1904, there was a provision carried on the appropriation bill then before the House that read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of State to mark the boundary, and make the survey incidental thereto, between the Territory of Alaska and the Dominion of Canada in conformity with the award of the Alaskan Boundary Commission.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that proposition was held to be in order. Why? As the Chair will note in the Digest, on page 348, it was held to be in order on an appropriation bill to continue the marking of a boundary line of the nation as the continuation of a public work. The appropriations had been made some years before for this service. They had expired. There was some intervening time, as I understand the proposition, and after-

wards there was enacted into an appropriation bill provision for sufficient money to carry on the work, and the Chairman, Mr. HEMENWAY, of Indiana, then occupying the chair, held it was in order on the appropriation bill, because it was a continuation of a public work. Now, the question that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] makes in reference to this Geological Survey—

Mr. OLMSTED. Will the gentleman allow me to make a small correction?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. HEMENWAY was chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and Mr. TAWNEY was in the chair and made the ruling.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It was Mr. HEMENWAY that was in favor of the proposition. The present chairman of the committee [Mr. TAWNEY] was in the chair.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I take it for granted there can be no distinction between a matter being a public work, to ascertain the boundary line of the United States and for a map to gauge a stream and survey the mineral domain of the United States, or the public national domain of the United States. This is a continuing work to-day, and I contend there is no distinction between the two cases, and I think on that precedent the Chair should hold this proposition in order.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, this point of order has been very fully discussed, and I do not desire to say very much upon it. I simply want to call the Chair's attention to one point with reference to the question which the Chair asked. The Chair asked the question as to the distinction between the national domain and public lands. There is no doubt the national domain includes forest reserves. But it should be remembered by the Chair that at the time the law establishing the Geological Survey was passed, which was read by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], there were no national forest reserves or parks.

On this point of order, in addition, I want to say to the Chair that it is perfectly clear to my own mind, standing upon the broad proposition stated by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], that this item, having been carried in an appropriation bill for many years under all the decisions and rulings of the Committee of the Whole and of the House, is the continuation of a public work. I do not see how any other view can be taken of it than that.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, there is one matter to which the attention of the Chair has not been called specifically, and that is the distinction between the provision for gauging streams and determining the water supply and the other provision to which the point of order has been made. The provision for gauging streams and determining the water supply does not rest upon the same basis as the other provision, because the item for gauging streams and determining the water supply was not first carried in an independent statute, but in an appropriation bill in 1894, and therefore the argument that this provision has been sanctioned by the action of Congress, that there is a settled construction by Congress, would not apply to that item. The mere fact that an item is carried for years in an appropriation bill is not to be regarded as of any value in determining the question of the validity of the original appropriation.

Now, I think that even if the Chair should rule that the term "public lands" and "national domain" are not convertible terms, but that the latter is a very much broader term, including the whole territory of the United States, and that therefore there is authority for investigating the products and mineral resources of the whole country and for preparing a geological map, it would not follow from that decision by any means that there would be any authority for gauging the streams of the United States and determining the water supply. I wanted to call the attention of the Chair to that point, because I believe in the decision of the Chair these items may be made separable. The main purpose, so far as I can discover, of gauging these streams is stated in the answer of the Director of the Geological Survey, to a question put by a member of the committee. Mr. Walcott, in answer to the question by the chairman, "What governmental purpose does that subserve?" said:

That serves the purpose of obtaining data in regard to flow through a succession of years on rivers running through many States, as several of them do, thus collecting information in regard to the water available for power or other useful purposes.

It is apparent from his answer that this work has no relation whatever to the investigation of the mineral resources of the United States or products of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Georgia, and then the gentleman from Indiana, who made the

point of order, and after that the Chair will decide, as the point of order has been generously discussed.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that there has been in many instances recognition by Congress in various statutes of the distinction between what is called "public domain" and the "national domain." There are a number of acts which show this distinction. I will call attention to the act of Congress of 1862, as amended by the act of 1888, authorizing telegraph companies to build telegraph lines over certain territory of the United States, and they always spoke of it as "public domain," showing clearly that Congress intended simply to grant power and authority to the telegraph companies to build their lines over land the title to which was in the United States as contradistinguished from "the national domain," the title to which would be in the States and in the United States.

Now, in the act of 1862, with reference to this, and the act of August 8, 1888, which is supplementary to the prior act on the subject, it uses this language, speaking of the telegraph lines:

Shall have the right to construct, maintain, and operate lines of telegraph through and over any portion of the public domain of the United States, over and along any of the military or post roads.

I read that for the purpose of showing that when the act of 1879, providing for the Geological Survey, used the words "national domain," that Congress meant what it said, and that in these other acts, when they used the language "public domain," they meant public lands of the United States and those lands over which the United States had exclusive ownership and jurisdiction and over which the States had no jurisdiction. Therefore, when Congress used the term "national domain," as it does in the act of 1879, it meant to authorize this geological survey upon any part of the United States, public domain of the United States, or domain of the United States which comes under the broad provision of "national domain."

One word further, Mr. Chairman. This act, up to last year and this year, provides for a continuation of this work of gauging streams—for the "continuation" of the work, showing that Congress recognized that it authorized the work to be instituted, and it has continued the work, through a number of years, in every appropriation bill since 1894. But I will call attention to the act of 1896, where the provision was made for this money for this work, and it is "to enable the Director of the United States Geological Survey to continue to gauge the streams and determine the water supply of the United States." Not water supply upon the public lands of the United States; not water supply of the navigable rivers of the United States, over which the United States has exclusive jurisdiction, but over the waterways of the United States. That would be synonymous, if they had stated over waterways of the national domain; and therefore this act authorized, in 1896, continuation of the work. The work has been in progress ever since. Various acts of Congress—appropriation acts, the appropriation act of 1905, the appropriation act of 1904, and in 1894 and 1895, and on—recognized it as a continuing work and for the benefit of the people of the United States. I do not think that the criticism made by the gentleman from Indiana, who makes the point of order, that the words "national domain" are synonymous and convertible with the term "public domain," is well founded. I do not care to detain the Chair any longer by reference to the other acts, but I could show them, as I have them compiled, for the benefit of the Chair, if he should wish it. The point I am insisting on is that where Congress has used the word intending to show authority over the lands of the United States, and over which the States have no control, they have invariably used the words "public domain" and "public lands;" where they intended to give authority generally to the United States they have used the words "national domain;" and to my mind the distinction is clear, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, gentlemen who have opposed this point of order have, in the main, it seems to me, overlooked the vital question in the case. For the sake of argument it might be admitted that the term "national domain" should have the signification contended for it. There is nothing in the statute that authorizes the making of geological maps for the United States or the gauging of streams with a view to ascertaining the water supply. There is nothing of that kind in the statute, even giving it the interpretation that gentlemen in opposition to the point of order contend.

Now, I think I can very briefly demonstrate that the term "national domain," in the sense of the law, does not have any such signification as is claimed for it by the gentlemen from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] and Ohio [Mr. KEFFER] and other gentlemen who have spoken in opposition to the point of order. The term "national domain" has a literary meaning, an historical meaning, a political meaning, and a legal meaning, and

we are dealing with it now as a part of a public statute. We are to give it its legal signification, not its literary meaning. I have before me Webster's International Dictionary, defining the meaning of the word "domain." It is defined to be "dominion, empire, authority." Nobody would pretend that the authority, the empire, of the United States is capable of being surveyed and its mineral resources determined.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Developed, you mean.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Developed. Another meaning is "the territory over which dominion or authority is exerted; the possessions of a sovereign or commonwealth, or the like."

Another is "landed property; estate; especially, the land about the mansion house of a lord, and in his immediate occupancy; demesne."

The legal meaning of the term is given by the dictionary as "ownership of land; an estate or patrimony," etc.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. If the gentleman will permit me to interrupt him there, I should like to ask if it was the intention of the Government to pursue its inquiry in the United States along the line of the legislation which we have been considering, what expression could be more effective than the term that was used in that act; and if it was used for the purpose of giving it effect and force, why should we not stand by it now?

Mr. TAWNEY. The language that the gentleman makes the point of order to is the language that is broader than that which is used in the act creating the Geological Survey.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I have already suggested that to the Chair—that the provisions I object to now are not included, even giving the term the broad meaning that the gentleman contends for it.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Your contention is that the appropriation bill goes further than the law.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That the appropriation bill goes further than the law, under any interpretation that may be given the law in the first place.

Mr. DALZELL. Does the gentleman think there could be an examination made of the geological structure of the country without mapping it?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. There might, of course.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Is not the matter a necessary incident?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Not a necessary but a reasonable incident; but the geological survey of a county does not authorize, as an incident, a map of the whole United States.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Will the gentleman allow me further to suggest there that in the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations it appeared that the State of Pennsylvania made a complete geological survey without any map, and that the sole excuse furnished for the United States spending money there is that that geological survey was not accompanied by maps?

Mr. KEIFER. I should like to interrupt. I think that is a mistake.

Mr. DALZELL. That has been partly done.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. And that shows that the State of Pennsylvania did make a complete geological survey without a map.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Was it not on the ground that the survey is incomplete and the map is necessary to make it complete?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Not at all. It was contended by the Director of the Geological Survey that it was hard to identify the geological survey with the location that was described without the maps, but the State of Pennsylvania made their geological survey complete without the maps.

Mr. SHERLEY. I simply want to ask the gentleman from Indiana if he is aware that the act creating the Geological Survey provides for maps and for the size of the volume in which they shall be printed? It provides that memoirs and reports of this Survey shall be issued in uniform quarto series if deemed necessary by the Director, or otherwise in ordinary octavo, and it speaks of the number of copies, providing for the issuing of maps, in the very act creating the Survey.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Now, suppose the Geological Survey should write an exhaustive history of the United States, along political and literary lines, along with the geological report of investigations for your section, would it have authority in law to do it?

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I would suggest to the gentleman that under the present directorate of the Geological Survey we have a history of the United States, and a very valuable one.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That may be. I will not discuss that. In relation to this particular question, the decision I submitted to the Chair earlier in the discussion, that the right, if any right of that kind is given at all, to make a map is confined to the map of the public domain, and the decision was acquiesced in by the House. Those in charge of the bill at that time,

after the proposition went out on a point of order, offered an amendment providing for the continuation and making the map of the geological survey of the national domain, putting in the limitation suggested by the Chair, and it was held in order.

Mr. KEIFER. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I have the record of the whole proceedings before me. The amendment was corrected in accordance with the suggestion of the Chair, and it was held in order. Then when the bill went to the Senate—and I have the original Senate bill—it was reported back and the words "national domain" were stricken out, and that is the way the provision got in the law. It was stricken out in the Senate, and the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House held that it was not in order, because it was not confined to the national domain.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. What did the Senate put in?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Just what is in it now.

Mr. KEIFER. Is it not a fact that since that became a law—since August, 1882—we have been using the words that are used in the bill now that the gentleman seeks to have stricken out?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I take it for granted and I am willing to admit—

Mr. KEIFER. It provides for a geological map of the United States, and are we not continuing that object under Rule XXI?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I am willing to admit that every appropriation bill since this ruling has contained the same language in relation to the geological map that I have made the point of order to in this bill, but it was confined to an appropriation and only created law for the fiscal year that the money was appropriated for, and did not, under the decisions of the House, become authority for subsequent appropriations.

Now, if the Chair please, I want to submit a definition from Black's Law Dictionary of the distinction between "public domain" and "national domain," if there be any. "Public domain" is defined to be: "This term embraces all lands the title to which is in the United States, including land occupied for the purpose of Federal buildings, arsenals, docks, etc., and land of an agricultural or of a mineral character not yet granted to private owners." That is the definition of "public domain." Now, "national domain" is substantially the same. This authority gives the definition of "national domain" to be: "A term sometimes used and applied to the aggregate of property owned directly by the nation." That is the only and the entire definition of the author in giving the legal definition of the terms and phrases that occur in the legislative and legal literature of the country.

Mr. DALZELL. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Certainly.

Mr. DALZELL. Is not the point of order the gentleman has made equally applicable to almost every paragraph of the appropriation for the Geological Survey?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I have not examined them carefully.

Mr. DALZELL. I will call the gentleman's attention to them and ask him.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I presume the questions will be raised as we proceed with the bill.

Mr. DALZELL. It seems to me it is a mighty important matter to know whether we are going to destroy the Geological Survey on points of order. The topographical survey is subject to a point of order, if the gentleman's position is correct.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It is if there is no authority in law for it; as many of these provisions as are not authorized by existing law are subject to a point of order.

Mr. DALZELL. There is no authorization unless "national domain" means what we contend it means, and the consequence is that every item almost belonging to the Geological Survey, with one or two exceptions, is absolutely stricken out by this point of order, and this Department, which has existed for twenty-six years, is proposed to be destroyed by a point of order, and I don't believe it can be done. [Applause.]

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I think the argument has no bearing on the question of law. Congress in using the term "national domain," in the statute referred to, must, of course, have used it in its legal signification, not in its historical signification, not in its political signification, but as bearing upon the real domain of the United States in its legal sense, and that means the public domain, the public lands.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. What is the land upon which I live, for instance, to what domain does that belong?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The chances are that it is the gentleman's domain. It is in the domain of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GROSVENOR. That is the domination that I have as owner.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. GROSVENOR. But under what domain, in a broad term, does it belong to?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is the point I want to make, and I thank the gentleman for making the suggestion. There are two domains. There is the State dominion and the national dominion, and when the Congress came to employ the term in this statute it said "national domain;" and the gentleman's home is under the State domain, under the sovereignty or dominion or government of the State of Ohio.

Mr. GROSVENOR. But when I put up a flag on my house it is always the Stars and Stripes.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. There is no doubt about that; and the gentleman is using the term in a political sense, in the sense of empire or sovereignty.

I undertake to say this: That Congress never used the term "national domain" in the sense that it gave permission to Federal officers to go into the States upon private property, to go where Congress had absolutely no power to send public officers to perform a duty. That was not and is not and can not be a Federal duty. We must presume that in using the term Congress used it for the carrying out of some duty or function that Congress had the power to carry out. There is not a gentleman on the floor of the House who will not admit that the State of Massachusetts, the State of Pennsylvania, or the State of Kentucky could exclude every single Federal official who goes there for the purpose of making a geological survey; who goes there for the purpose of making topographical maps; who goes there for the purpose of gauging streams. It is a purely voluntary service. It is not a national function, and I appeal to the argument of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], made a few weeks ago in the House, to refute the argument that he has advanced to-day. Congress, when it used that term, used it in its legal signification, to apply to the property that is owned by the Federal Government, property that it was preparing for the market, that it was seeking information about in order that investors might be attracted; and if this survey has been extended by acquiescence from State to State and from county to county and from township to township and municipality to municipality, it is purely a voluntary service, a service that does not belong to the Federal Government, and there is no authority of law for it. It seems to me that there can be no doubt that the point of order is well taken. I am ready to submit the question.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. But what authority has the Agricultural Department for inquiring into the character of soils in the State of Michigan? It has unquestioned authority which is conceded by the State of Michigan, for it is intended to help the State and not to harm it; the people welcome it; and the national domain certainly would include all our sovereign territory, which might be properly investigated and examined.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks this question has been discussed with great freedom, and is ready to submit his ruling on the question involved. It is difficult for the Chair as a Member of the House, as it doubtless is for every other Member of the House, to divorce his ideas as to what the law is, the cold-blooded law, from the sentiment involved in the controversy. The Chair is of opinion that the point of order is well taken. The only authority for the enactment of the sections to which the point of order lies is that they are public works in progress. The Chair thinks that it would have been better had the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] made the point of order on the different phrases instead of the lines. "To continue the preparation of a geological map of the United States" is one proposition. "Gauging streams and determining the water supply of the United States" is a separate and distinct proposition, and in the opinion of the Chair the point of order to these different propositions rests upon different grounds. As the Chair stated in the beginning, the broad proposition that they are public works in progress rests upon two grounds; first, that there is authority of law for the work contemplated by the section, or secondly, that even though they were never authorized by express statute, they are yet works which were begun under authority of Congress, and are therefore works in progress within the meaning, which is a well-established meaning, of the rule of this House. In order to determine whether or not there is authority of law for the first proposition, "to continue the preparation of a geological map of the United States"—

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, with the Chair's permission, I would like to state that I shall withdraw the point of order to that provision—the continuation of the maps—and confine it to the gauging of streams.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion that it is wise in the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] to withdraw

the point, because it rests upon an entirely different basis from the other proposition involved—gauging streams and determining the water supply. In order to determine whether or not there is authority of law for these works, either of them, recourse may be had to the statute creating the Geological Survey, defining the duties of the officer in charge, and limiting the scope of his authority. And in order that the statute may be intelligently discussed and understood it might perhaps be well to call attention to the conditions which existed with reference to the Geological Survey before the enactment of that statute. This question has been somewhat discussed by gentlemen, and the Chair will not go fully into details; but previous to that time, without any authority of law for making these surveys, appropriation bills had repeatedly contained provisions for geological surveys. For instance, in 1872 (this law having been enacted in 1879), the appropriation bill for that year contained this clause:

For the continuation of a geological and geographical survey of the Territories of the United States, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior.

In 1873 there was a like provision, and again in 1875 and 1877. In other words, before the enactment of the statute of 1879, creating the office of a Geological Survey and defining the powers of the officer in charge, the appropriations for geological surveys were always confined to the Territories of the United States. Now, in 1878 the cause of the confusion which theretofore existed—and that confusion the Chair will briefly call attention to—grew out of the fact that the different Departments of the Government undertook to assume jurisdiction of various phases of geological surveys, paleontological surveys, ethnological surveys, and all that sort of thing; so that in 1879 we had a geological and geographical survey of the Territories, a geographical and geological survey of the Rocky Mountain region under the Department of the Interior, geographical surveys west of the one hundredth meridian under the War Department, and confusion resulted because of these several jurisdictions. Thereupon the National Academy of Sciences, in 1878, owing to this confusion and a desire that there should be order and harmony, passed a resolution in this language, which will throw some light upon the statute that was thereafter enacted in response to the demand of the National Academy of Sciences, and will throw some light upon a correct interpretation and construction of that statute.

Mr. TAWNEY. If the Chair will pardon me—

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. TAWNEY. A resolution was adopted by Congress calling upon the Academy and Congress requested—

The CHAIRMAN. Did the Chair state it the other way?

Mr. TAWNEY. The Chair stated the resolution was adopted by the Academy of Sciences.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thanks the gentleman; it was a resolution adopted by Congress, as follows:

Provided, That the National Academy of Sciences is hereby requested at their next meeting to take into consideration the method and expense of conducting all surveys of a scientific character under the War or Interior Department and the surveys of the Land Office, and to report to Congress as soon thereafter as may be practicable a plan for surveying and mapping the Territories of the United States on such general system as will, in their judgment, secure the best results at the least possible cost.

This resolution had reference solely to the Territories of the United States. Under the foregoing provision the National Academy of Sciences recommended, almost in the exact language of the statute immediately thereafter adopted by Congress:

That Congress establish under the Department of the Interior an independent organization, to be known as the United States Geological Survey, to be charged with the study of the geological structure and economical resources of the public domain; such survey to be placed under a Director, to be appointed by the President, etc.

Having reference to what? Manifestly to what had been done always before in the history of the Geological Survey; manifestly to what had been called for by the resolution of Congress made to the Academy of Sciences, the Territories of the United States or the public domain. Now, the Chair desires to call attention to the specific item referred to, the gauging of streams and the determining of the water supply of the United States. When the statute creating the Office of Geological Survey was passed it had in it this language, and the Chair assumes that if the Geological Survey of the United States has any power, it was conferred upon the Geological Survey by the express language of this statute, and aside from this statute it has no power. Here is the provision:

Provided, That this officer shall have the direction of the geological survey and the classification of the public lands and the examination of the geological structure, mineral resources, and products of the national domain.

Now, will the gentleman contend, or has it been contended, that the gauging of a stream comes within any of those pro-

visions? Manifestly not, and the Chair believes that even if the language in the appropriation bill was entirely different from what it is and confined to gauging of streams of the public domain, that it would not be in order. Can the gauging of streams be held to be a part of the geological survey, a classification of the public lands, the examination of the geological structure, the examination of the mineral resources, or an examination of the products of the national domain? The Chair thinks not. The Chair thinks that the only power that the Geological Survey has has been conferred upon him by the express language of this statute. Aside from that he has no power, and the gauging of streams is not within the provision of these several powers conferred upon him by this statute. Therefore the Chair thinks clearly the term "gauging of streams and determining the water supply" does not fall within any of the provisions of the statute creating the Office of the Geological Survey and defining and limiting the power of its officers. Furthermore, in order to determine whether or not there is authority of law for the work contemplated, we have recourse to the statute passed in 1879, as the Chair has already said; and the Chair repeats that, in the opinion of the Chair, even if the language of the appropriation bill under consideration confined the gauging of a stream and the determining of the water supply of the United States to the national domain, it would yet not be in order. Why not? The Chair thinks it is obnoxious and the point of order should be sustained.

Secondly, because the authority conferred by the law upon the Director of the Geological Survey has reference only to the national domain. And the Chair thinks there has been some confusion in terms between the "national domain" and "public domain." The Chair believes that the District of Columbia is the national domain, but yet it is certainly not the public domain, because the public domain has reference only to the public lands, and "public domain" and "public lands" are terms interchangeably used, in the opinion of the Chair, and mean one and the same thing, and they have reference to land which can be distributed for settlement. The forest reserves are a part of the national domain, and yet are not a part of the public lands, because they have been disposed of. The Chair believes that the Territory of New Mexico is a part of the national domain, and yet vast portions of it which have already been distributed and are already settled are not a part of the public domain. The Chair thinks that that is a distinction which has been lately made and that it is the wise distinction to make in this instance.

Now, what is the other question involved? The only other jurisdiction for the enactment of this section is that it is a public work already in progress within the meaning of our rule. And the reason given therefor is that previous statutes heretofore enacted have contained this express provision. The rule of this House imposes this limitation on the power of the House as to legislation on appropriation bills, that no appropriation shall be made for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless such proposed expenditure is in continuation of a public work or object already in progress—that is, a public work or object previously appropriated for and yet not completed. But what is a public work in progress? In order to ascertain that, it will be necessary to have recourse to the discussions on these specific propositions. It has been repeatedly held, and held in one instance by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED], that the term "public work" as contemplated by the rule of the House clearly has reference to some tangible matter, as to a building, or a road, and such other matters of a like character as will readily suggest themselves.

Now, at the first session of the Fifty-first Congress this subject was taken up, and Mr. Payson, of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, in a decision which the Chair regards, after careful examination, was as well considered, if not better, than any other one made on this subject, held that the term "public work" had reference only to a tangible matter. The case is so clear in point and is so certainly decisive of the question involved that the Chair will take the liberty of calling the attention of the committee to it by quoting a part of it:

If this provision—

He says, and it is not necessary to state what provision, because the language is readily applicable to this provision—

is properly in this bill at all, the point of order being raised against it, it must be, in the judgment of the Chair, because it is connected with an "object already in progress" under the statutes of the United States.

The term "public works," in the judgment of the Chair, clearly contemplates tangible matters, as buildings, roads, and such other matters as readily suggest themselves.

So the question only remains, Does the expression "objects already in progress" include the duties to be performed by this board during the ensuing year?

It must be remembered that these duties are only to hear and deter-

mine appeals from the Commissioner of Pensions to the Secretary, and to be settled by that officer, but, as it is practically impossible for the Secretary to do this, the performance of that duty is devolved upon this board as part of the force in the Secretary's office.

The duties are only part of the ordinary duties of an important executive office—routine duties, to be performed as the papers come to the Secretary's office day by day.

These duties so to be performed are not, in the judgment of the Chair, the "object in progress" contemplated by the rule.

Then the Chair well says:

The clause in the rule contemplates specific legislation for a certain purpose, for which provision has been made by law, but which specific legislation has not been consummated by an attainment of the object under the appropriation made for it and for which the appropriation made had proved insufficient.

In such case the rule allows an appropriation on a general bill to complete the "object." But the clause does not include the ordinary performance of regular routine duty by the clerical force in the Department.

A decision more clearly in point and on all fours with the present case was rendered by Hon. SERENO E. PAYNE in the second session of the Fifty-fourth Congress. At that time Mr. JAMES A. TAWNEY, of Minnesota, offered this amendment.

The Chair calls attention to the similarity between the amendment offered by the gentleman, in effect, to the one under consideration at this time:

Fiber investigations: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to continue the investigations relating to textile fibers indigenous in or adapted to the United States, including their economic growth, cleansing, and decorticating.

The Chair again calls attention to the exact language:

Fiber investigations: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to continue investigations—

Investigations having theretofore been authorized by previous appropriation bills. Thereupon, Mr. WADSWORTH, of New York, made the point of order, and the Chairman, Mr. PAYNE, held that the amendment was not in order, as the investigation was not such a tangible thing as would bring it within the exception whereby public works may be continued.

Mr. OLMSTED, of Pennsylvania, held later, under a similar point of order, public works and objects to mean "tangible matters, like buildings," etc., and "that the mere appropriation of a salary does not thereby create an office so as to justify appropriations in the succeeding year."

Now, the gist of these decisions is: Was it a public object in progress at the time the appropriation was asked for? If so, it must be a tangible work, something that would be completed. An object that could be completed at some time, something with a definite, fixed object, and not a continuing something; that it must have a definite end in sight in order to be an object in progress within the meaning of this rule. Provision for gauging streams is not a tangible object. It is not a definite something that can be concluded, nor is a determination of the water supply of the United States such a definite object in progress; and because of these statements, and because of these reasons, the Chair believes that the point of order should be sustained as to these two items, the gentleman from Indiana having withdrawn the point of order on the other item, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WILEY of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

If I had that voice of thunder and that throat of brass which Homer wrote of, or if I had some of the eloquence with which this Chamber resounds, I would feel that I could not use them to better purpose than in the discussion of this bill which is now before us; but the curriculum of the scientific school does not include the art of oratory. Engineers are men of deeds rather than of words, and their motto is: "Res non verba." It is possible this accounts for the few engineers sent to Congress. Moreover, I find myself somewhat hampered by the limitations of this debate under the five-minute rule, and I hope the House will be very generous with me if I have to exceed that time, as I fear I must. I feel like exclaiming with that Latin writer: "When I labor to be brief, I find that I am made obscure." Hence I am forced to write what I should like to deliver without writing.

The work of the Geological Survey is one of the most national enterprises undertaken by the Government, and can not be judged by rules which might be applied to other governmental functions.

A scientific investigation, to be of value, must be not only thorough, but complete. No reliable deductions can be drawn from a half truth; indeed, this half truth may be the most dangerous form of error. It is the acting on half truths which makes men nihilists, anarchists, and criminals.

I am willing to concede to the committee in charge of this bill that they were actuated by a sincere desire to save the public money, and economy is always to be commended unless it degenerates into parsimony, when it is not only unwise, but

far more expensive than lavishness would be. I want to point out certain illustrations of this parsimonious economy falsely so called, which have come under my own observation.

The freeholders of a certain county desired to erect a stone arch bridge and applied to an engineer to superintend it. He stated his salary at \$2,500 and declined the \$1,500 they offered, so they, in their desire to save the difference, employed a "practical man" at \$1,500. He erected the bridge, and before it was open for traffic it fell in and had to be razed to its foundations, costing the county \$30,000.

I know an engineer who reported a bridge as unsafe. He did it on several occasions, and he asked for \$20,000 with which to make that bridge secure, but his directors refused the money and told him to get along without it. One night in the dead of winter a train went through that bridge and 50 people were burned up and 200 more were injured. The engineer brooded over the misfortune, which was in no way his fault, until he became insane and committed suicide. It cost that road over a half million dollars for damages. While I was sorry for the accident, I was also sorry that the damages were not a million dollars instead of half a million. I could give other instances constantly occurring in the lives of engineers, showing the folly of parsimonious economy, which masquerades as economy.

The estimates submitted to the Committee on Appropriations of this House were carefully prepared by the various chiefs of bureaus in charge of the work contemplated. They were exact estimates, asking only for what was needed, neither more nor less, and there is submitted to this House an estimate made by the committee, a body that could not possibly understand the needs of the Survey, cutting down some estimates one-half, and making an average reduction of one-fifth.

One word here as to the character and attainments of the members of the Geological Survey. In common with the engineering fraternity, I have been in close touch with them for twenty years or more. Engineers look upon them as scientists of the highest standing, and accept their conclusions as reliable and of the greatest value to the profession. They are enthusiasts on the lines of discovery, and there is hardly one of them who could not better his position financially by leaving it. I know much higher salaries have been offered several, but their love for these investigations is so great, and the opportunities of the Government service for scientific research are so attractive to them that they can not be tempted by mere money. Their interest is in science and in science alone.

To show how cutting down an appropriation not only cripples an investigation, but practically neutralizes its results, take the gauging of streams when one-half the appropriation has been cut off. This work must be continuous to enable any definite conclusions to be reached. It will not answer to gauge a stream now and then. The conduct of the stream must be studied year in and year out, so as to predicate on the flow of water as to its amount, velocity, and other actions, under all possible circumstances. In order to make this work of value, it must be continued to completion. Partial results have been obtained on the gauging of streams, and as far as they go they are all right, but until they are complete they are of no practical value to anybody. It may be asked, indeed I have been asked, why the Government should undertake these matters instead of leaving them to private enterprises? There are two reasons: First, few private enterprises could conduct them on the scale on which the Government has done, and will do if this House will give them means to go forward, as they have the plant already constructed to undertake the investigations.

Mr. TAWNEY. I should like to ask the gentleman from New Jersey when he obtained consent to proceed indefinitely in delivering this speech?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BOUTELL). The present occupant of the chair will state that he just took the chair, to relieve the previous occupant, and does not know what arrangement was made.

Mr. TAWNEY. I do not understand that the gentleman received unanimous consent to proceed indefinitely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

[By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota and Mr. BENNET of New York, the time of Mr. WILEY of New Jersey was extended ten minutes.]

Mr. WILEY of New Jersey. I said that few private enterprises could carry out this work as the Government can do it.

Mr. TAWNEY. I desire to ask the gentleman if he is reading the same document that was printed in the RECORD a few days ago by the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. WILEY of New Jersey. I really do not know. This is what I wrote myself. [Laughter.] I was not aware that the gentleman from Ohio had obtained access to my manuscript.

Mr. TAWNEY. I was informed that it was the brief prepared by the Geological Survey.

Mr. WILEY of New Jersey. This is a brief prepared by myself.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman from Minnesota has referred to that two or three times. I made no pretense that that was my own production.

Mr. TAWNEY. I did not say you did.

Mr. GROSVENOR. But I think it was a credit to myself that I was able to get it, and I think it would have been a credit to the gentleman from Minnesota if he had. [Applause.]

Mr. WILEY of New Jersey. Second, while the Government results are disinterested and will favor no one unduly, a private investigation is always open to the suspicion of partisanship. The result announced by the Government will have a weight with the engineers and the public which the private investigation will never attain. Moreover, the subjects investigated are of inestimable value to the Government itself; for instance, take the fuel test. I saw the plant at St. Louis erected during my term as State commissioner. I understand the Government contributed \$50,000 toward its erection, and from other sources \$100,000 was added. The railroad companies were so impressed with the value of these experiments that they have hauled cars of fuel without charge. This is especially true of the southern and western railroads. In this connection, I want to read a report made to the President of the United States on the 6th day of June, 1906.

TO THE PRESIDENT: The executive committee of the advisory board on fuels and structural materials, recently appointed by you, respectfully ask your attention to the following facts brought out in connection with the inquiry made at the request of this board.

I omit all not bearing on the tests of fuel and structural materials.

When it is remembered that the yearly losses from fire in the United States aggregate \$2.50 per capita, as compared with 33 cents per capita in European countries; that the fire losses in the United States during the past ten years have aggregated not less than \$1,250,000,000; that the people expend annually in building and construction work \$1,000,000,000, and that this Government itself expends annually for such purposes more than \$20,000,000, it is apparent that this whole subject deserves the most serious consideration by the Government.

This committee furthermore begs to express the opinion that a thorough investigation of the properties of the materials of construction and fireproofing, and the resulting increased economies in our systems of construction, may be expected to save annually from 5 to more than 10 per cent of these total expenditures, which would mean an annual saving to the Government alone on its present expenditures of from one to two million dollars and to the people of this country a saving of many millions each year.

Very respectfully,

O. H. ERNST, *Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army,*
Isthmian Canal Commission,
JAMES K. TAYLOR, *Superior Architect,*
ROBERT W. HUNT, *Chicago, Ill.,*
President American Institute Mining Engineers,
CHARLES A. HEXAMER, *Philadelphia,*
Chairman Board of Experts,
National Fire Underwriters' Association,
HENRY G. STOTT, *New York,*
Interboro Rapid Transit Company,
Executive Committee National Advisory Board for
Fuels and Structural Materials.

After a full investigation it was at once discovered that a fair grade of fuel gas could be obtained from certain lignites which had no great value previously. The importance of this to the Government is at once seen when we consider not only the more convenient location of many fuels to the points where their use by the United States is required, but a greater value arises from the results of the use of the fuel gas itself. Naval experts were at the same time testing coal, and, by the way, that was picked coal from the mines, while the Government test was of coal where the man was sent to the mines and took cars of coal as they ran from the mine, and those cars were under supervision until they arrived at the point where the coal was tested; and therefore it is a disinterested test and a fair test of the coal from that mine. Now, the naval experts were at the same time testing coal, and obtained 2.2 pounds of coal per hour per horsepower. The fuel gas obtained the same result from 0.87 pound. Not only is this saving extremely valuable, but the saving in space required for fuel on a war ship is of even much greater value in the present overcrowded condition of our naval vessels.

Take another instance, the cement test: It has been found from them that by making certain combinations of rock and slate and burning them in a peculiar manner rock hitherto supposed to be unavailable can now be made into cement equal to the Portland brand, and I have been told personally by a Government official this knowledge will save \$1,000,000 per annum on Government buildings under construction.

The tests for reenforced concrete are of extreme value, not only for the construction of public buildings, but for the erec-

tion of many of the Government dams designed for the Reclamation Service on the line of the Panama Canal.

As to the mineral resources, I would like to read a few statistics.

In 1901, when the appropriation for mineral resources was placed for the first time at \$50,000, the total value of the mineral production of the United States was a little over \$1,086,000,000. During the last five years there has been a most remarkable development in nearly all branches of the mining industry, and according to the returns of the Geological Survey for 1905 the production for that year will exceed that of 1901 by over 50 per cent.

The history of the coal production alone is one of great interest. It is necessary to keep in touch with developments in the mining interest by correspondence, and so all these matters are utilized for the benefit of the country at large.

Under the rules it is impossible to more than indicate these matters and let the thoughtful mind carry them forward to a legitimate conclusion, but in general I want to beg of this House to view the question of appropriations for the Survey from the standpoint of the American citizen—nonpartisan, nonpolitical—and resist firmly any attempt to stifle the acquiring and distribution of knowledge, for this I consider to be not only the legitimate function of the Government, but one of its highest and most valuable functions.

In that connection I want to say that reading from the reports of the Panama Canal the other day I found that in determining the seepage through the dam at Gatun the engineer, Mr. Stearns, a week ago Sunday, in his testimony before the Canal Commission, and others, made the statement that what they relied on principally to determine the seepage in compressed earth were the experiments made by the Geological Survey, as he knew them to be thoroughly reliable. Give, then, our patient and self-sacrificing scientists an opportunity to complete their arduous tasks by restoring their appropriation to its full amount, and not only will they rise up and call you blessed, but the country at large will join with them, and the knowledge that a Member of Congress voted to continue these investigations will be a first-class campaign document this fall, and the result will be that the complexion of the next Congress will be very similar to the one that I now see around me.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman if this gauging of streams is carried on in connection with the question of water-storage problem?

Mr. WILEY of New Jersey. I should judge it had its bearing on it if they were storing water from that particular stream. In New York State at present they are going to build a large dam in the Catskills to get water.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. The city of New York?

Mr. WILEY of New Jersey. The city of New York.

Mr. Chairman, in this connection I desire to call attention to several letters that I have, which, with the permission of the House, I will insert in the RECORD. When this matter was brought up I wrote to prominent men around the United States and asked them for an expression of their opinion, and I append herewith the letters which I have received in reply to the letters which I sent out. They are as follows:

Hon. W. H. WILEY,
Member House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In response to your inquiry of the 26th ultimo, which unfortunately did not reach me until now, as I am located temporarily down here at York, Pa., I will say that I trust the investigation which the Department of the United States Geological Survey has made regarding fuels, and which has been conducted at St. Louis during the past two years, may be continued still further. I consider it one of the most important subjects and one of the greatest possible value to all the industries of this country.

The work, as far as it has progressed, is well and conscientiously done, and is of an inestimable value; but I am assured that it could be still further pursued and still greater advantages obtained. No private individual and no association of engineers could have the facilities, the time, or afford the expense of arriving at a thoroughly scientific data on this subject. I have studied with immense benefit the work which has been accomplished, and I trust, as stated above, that this work will be continued.

I am, very respectfully, yours,
CHARLES EKSTRAND,
Mechanical and Electrical Engineer.

RICKETTS & BANKS,
CHEMISTS, ASSAYERS, AND MINING ENGINEERS,
New York, May 29, 1906.

Hon. W. H. WILEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In response to your inquiry I would say that I have followed the work of the United States Geological Survey coal-testing plant at St. Louis with much interest. The care with which the equipment has been selected and the precautions taken to insure uniform conditions in all comparative tests have been very gratifying.

Many tests of coal have been made in the past by various operators, and some of the published records are of considerable interest and value; but the data available are scattered and incomplete. Many of the tests have been made under unfavorable conditions and many others

under conditions not fully set forth, so that the results are for the greater part inconclusive and not comparable. Often they are unreliable. Faulty samples, the use of inadequate or not properly calibrated apparatus, and in many cases lack of experience of the investigator have combined to introduce factors of uncertainty, which render the reported results often unsatisfactory and unsuitable for use as a basis for close comparisons.

I doubt if there is to-day a thoroughly equipped fuel-testing plant in this country outside of the Government's plant at St. Louis. The cost of providing and maintaining such a plant is too great to be undertaken by private capital. The need of it has been sorely felt by engineers and all interested in the vast field of fuel utilization. Although the plant at St. Louis has already done some excellent work, much still remains to be accomplished. It would be an inestimable loss to engineers and the people at large if a work so favorably begun should not be carried to completion. The Survey now has a corps of trained operators and an equipment carefully standardized. The amount of money required to continue and complete the work is a trifle in comparison with the value of the data to be obtained. Let us hope that we may realize all that the opportunity presented affords, and that Congress may make a liberal provision to carry on the work to a successful completion.

Yours, very truly,

JOHN H. BANKS.

SYRACUSE, N. Y., March 21, 1906.

Hon. M. E. DRISCOLL,
Congressman Twenty-ninth district, State of New York,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am in receipt of Senate Document No. 214, subject, "Fuels and structural materials," being a letter from the Secretary of the Interior to the President of the United States, "transmitting a copy of a letter from the Director of the Geological Survey embodying a summary of the results obtained in the investigations under the survey of fuels and structural materials at the testing plants at St. Louis, etc., pursuant to Senate resolution No. 68," regarding which I wish to ask your kindest attention to the recommendations of Director Charles D. Walcott. It would be impossible for anyone to overestimate the value which continued investigation upon the lines recommended would mean to this nation. The work is wholly industrial as well as thoroughly scientific in character. The results obtained are of instant application to everyone—workmen and owners alike—connected or interested in mines and manufactures.

I can not take either your time or mine to go into details further than to say that even industries as large as those I am connected with, with their able corps of chemists and other investigators, find it impossible to do all they would like to do in these suggested lines of investigation. The United States Government can best do this, and by freely publishing the results lend assistance to all interested.

A year ago, at this time, while in Washington during the mining engineers' convention, I visited the Government laboratories, and there learned many lessons as to the very great importance of the investigations being carried on. Therefore, with all the earnestness of which I am capable, I would ask you to make this subject one of serious interest, and if convinced of the truth and force of my statements, do all you possibly can toward obtaining the appropriation which will continue this important work.

I would be grateful to you, if you think it proper, to have you forward to our Senators copies of this communication, or to anyone else concerned.

With best wishes, and a hearty "thank you" in advance, I remain,
Yours, sincerely,

J. WM. SMITH,
Assistant General Manager the Solvay Process Company.

Heartily approved.

W. B. COGSWELL,
Vice-President and Managing Director.

GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY,
Schenectady, N. Y., June 2, 1906.

Hon. W. H. WILEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In regard to your inquiry in relation to the practical value of the investigation of fuels begun at the St. Louis Exposition, writer feels that there is a great deal to be learned by an investigation carried on to the extent possible by the Government. There is a great deal of valuable fuel burned without proper economy, largely through ignorance in regard to the best way to burn it. The more knowledge we have on this subject the better.

Yours, very truly,

A. S. MANN.

SYRACUSE, N. Y., June 4, 1906.

Hon. W. H. WILEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of May 26 relative to the continuing of the investigation of fuels, as conducted under the Geological Survey at the St. Louis Exposition during the past two years, I would say that I think it is most important that this work be carried on. I would also like to add that the information obtained from such investigations should be gotten into the hands of the public as soon thereafter as is possible in order to make such investigations as useful and practical as possible.

Yours, very truly,

ABRAM S. BALDWIN,
Assistant Manager Soda Ash Department,
The Solvay Process Company.

NEW YORK, June 2, 1906.

Hon. W. H. WILEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR WILEY: I feel impelled to write to you as to the very great value I attach to the investigations of fuels which have been going on under the Geological Survey at St. Louis, and how greatly they ought to profit the industries of this country. You are already so familiar with the general merits of the case that it is needless for me to enter into an argument, but so far as I have noticed there is a general feeling that this work is of very great public usefulness.

Yours, very truly,

HENRY M. HOWE.

FRANK KLEPETKO, CONSULTING ENGINEER,
New York, May 28, 1906.

Hon. W. H. WILEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We wish to express our approval and our appreciation of the importance of continuing the investigation of fuels which has been conducted under the Geological Survey at St. Louis during the past two years. We have looked over the copies of reports which have been sent us with a great deal of interest, and as soon as we have time we go into them very much more in detail.

Trusting that you will be able to continue this excellent work, we are,
Yours, very truly,

FRANK KLEPETKO,
By C. V. DREW.

KAATERSKILL PAVING BRICK COMPANY,
Catskill, N. Y., May 28, 1906.

Hon. W. H. WILEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In response to your inquiry in regard to the importance of continuing the investigation of fuels, which has been conducted under the Geological Survey at St. Louis during the past two years, I wish to say that I think this work will prove of very great practical value to manufacturers and others, as these tests can be relied upon, and any person wanting a certain fuel for a given purpose can at once select that fuel and know just what it will do without having to go through expensive and laborious experiments.

I am thoroughly convinced that if this is conducted in the proper manner that it will prove of vast importance to consumers.

Very respectfully, yours,
S. H. BROCKUMER, Mining Engineer.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., May 28, 1906.

Hon. Wm. H. WILEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WILEY: Answering your inquiry as to the importance of continuing the investigation of fuels which has been conducted under the Geological Survey of St. Louis during the past two years: I look upon this investigation as one of the most important, particularly to the manufacturing industries of the United States, that has been undertaken for many years in our country. The facts already brought out as to the best way to use the coal produced in different sections of our country will be invaluable in helping each section to use the apparatus best suited to its particular type of coal, and will also enable manufacturers to definitely decide that they can profitably build factories in certain parts of the country where in the past the question of suitable fuel has been looked upon as an almost insurmountable obstacle.

I should very strongly urge you and your friends in Congress to advocate a liberal appropriation for this purpose.

Yours, sincerely,
FRED W. TAYLOR,
President American Society Mechanical Engineers.

SIBLEY COLLEGE, CORNELL UNIVERSITY,
Ithaca, N. Y., May 28, 1906.

Hon. W. H. WILEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This letter is in response to your inquiry asking for my opinion of the work under the Geological Survey at the coal-testing plant in St. Louis.

I have received the reports of this work, and have examined them with some care, and they surely are a distinct contribution to the data available to the mechanical engineers of this country. The value of these investigations seems to me so great that I sincerely hope appropriations may be made which warrant their continuance.

Yours, respectfully,
ALBERT W. SMITH.

PENNSYLVANIA COAL AND COKE COMPANY,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Philadelphia, Pa., May 29, 1906.

Hon. W. H. WILEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In response to your inquiry, I beg to say that, in my opinion, a continuance of the fuel investigation which has been conducted under the Geological Survey at St. Louis during the past two years is very desirable, not only from the standpoint of the producer, but from that of the consumer also, in that it gives absolutely reliable data as to the quality of the various coals of the country and their adaptability for specific purposes. This information is not at present available, and by reason of its great cost is not obtainable by the average individual or company.

Hoping that the appropriation for carrying on this important work will be made upon a liberal basis, I beg to remain,
Very truly, yours,

W. A. LATHROP, President.

G. E. ALKINS, COAL AND COKE,
Chicago, May 28, 1906.

Hon. W. H. WILEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: In response to your inquiry, I desire to say that the information furnished manufacturers and other large consumers of coal through the medium of the experiments conducted under the Geological Survey at St. Louis, Mo., is of very great value. Owing to the vast variety of coals produced in this country and the variations in their value, consumers have been at a loss frequently for proper units of value from which to calculate the relative efficiency of fuels offered for sale in the markets of the several States.

Large varieties of coal are transported to central points of distribution, and frequently they represent the products of several States. For example, Chicago, Ill., receives shipments from Pennsylvania, Maryland, the Virginias, Ohio, Indiana, Kentucky, and Tennessee, besides the product of the mines of Illinois. Each of these States contains within its boundary numerous varieties of coal, all of which vary in value at the mine, and many of which carry variations in freights. The work of the fuel-testing plant at St. Louis has covered a wide field, and much remains to be accomplished. In fact, the field for work

is practically inexhaustible, and it is of the utmost importance that these investigations be continued for a long time in the future if, indeed, the fuel-testing plant should not be permanently continued under the direction of the Survey.

Yours, very respectfully,
G. E. ALKINS.

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE COLLEGE,
DEPARTMENT OF MINES AND MINING,
State College, Pa., May 28, 1906.

Hon. W. H. WILEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In response to your request, I would state that the industrial life and prosperity of any nation must depend upon its husbanding its resources and using them in the most economical way possible. This has been well shown in this country by the rapid destruction of our timber, and in England by the gradual exhaustion of its iron ores and coal.

Anything that can be done to enable our coal resources to be used economically, to save the fine coal which is at the present time largely wasted, and to employ materials now considered of but little value for the production of gas, are subjects that are intimately interwoven with the future prosperity of this nation.

I feel that the testing plant of the Geological Survey has already done much in this direction, but the work needs to be continued, as far more valuable results ought and can be obtained if it is properly sustained.

I hope everything that the Government can consistently do will be done in developing the lines of research inaugurated in 1904.

Very respectfully, yours,
M. EDWARD WADSWORTH.

SYRACUSE, N. Y., May 28, 1906.

Hon. W. H. WILEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Replying to your inquiry of May 26, I am glad to express my approval of the work done by the Geological Survey at St. Louis during the past two years in the investigation of fuels.

The growth of the by-product coke-oven plants in the United States during the past ten years, and the certain very rapid increase of these plants, makes it very important that the country be well informed as to the quality of the different fuels available for all purposes.

The steel industry has been blessed with Connellsville coal, which has enabled a good metallurgical coke to be made with very simple means. The exhaustion of this deposit is very near, and we must turn to other fields, where coals, which will not make metallurgical coke in the ordinary beehive oven, require by-product ovens, which will make good coke.

The production of power by means of gas engines from producer gas is very rapidly coming forward, and the producer is still a crude apparatus, susceptible of very many improvements, which will make it a continuous automatic machine, capable of handling almost any kind of coal—some coals are much better adapted than others for this purpose—and especially in the recovery of by-products, both in the coke-oven and producer industries, it is important that the country has carefully made tests and records of the qualities of the different fuels.

While a great deal of work has been done by private companies and individuals in this direction, the results have not been widely published, and I believe it would be of great benefit to the country at large to have an investigation completed in an authoritative way by the Geological Survey. I think the plant for these investigations should be increased to include the very best up-to-date apparatus and instruments and placed under the control of the best experts the Government can obtain.

It is of great importance to the agricultural community, as well as to the country at large, that the criminal waste of the by-products of coal, which has been going on for centuries, be stopped, and the ammonia and tar products be utilized for fertilizers and the countless by-products which are so important to our industries.

It certainly is the function of the Government to educate the manufacturers in the saving of these by-products, and the agriculturists and textile industries in the use of them. A preliminary step in this education is the obtaining of important information as to the fuels from which these by-products will come.

I am heartily in favor of an extension of the good work, and remain,
Very respectfully, yours,

EDW. N. TRUMP,
General Manager and Chief Engineer the Solvay Process Co.
Vice-President and Consulting Engineer Smet-Solvay Co.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF PITTSBURG,
Pittsburg, Pa., June 1, 1906.

Hon. W. H. WILEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In accordance with your request of the 26th ultimo, asking for a letter expressing approval of the continued investigations of fuels, etc., by the Geological Survey Bureau, I inclose herewith a copy of resolutions adopted by the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, May 31, 1906.

Yours, very truly,
LOGAN MCKEE,
Secretary.

[Chamber of commerce. United States testing laboratory.]

Whereas an act is now pending in Congress providing for an appropriation of \$350,000, the amount estimated and recommended by the Secretary of the Interior as necessary to carry on the investigations of the Geological Survey Bureau of fuels and structural materials at testing plants at present located at St. Louis; and

Whereas the board of directors of the chamber of commerce believe that such investigation should be continued and would be of inestimable value to the manufacturing interests of the country; and

Whereas the chamber of commerce of the city of Pittsburg is convinced that the ideal location for testing laboratories and investigations of this character is the city of Pittsburg, or its immediate vicinity, being the largest producer of fuel and structural materials in the world: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That this board of directors of the chamber of commerce of the city of Pittsburg requests the Senators and the Representatives from the Pittsburg district, and those Senators and Representatives from adjoining cities and counties to favor the passage of the act carrying such appropriation as may be considered sufficient, provided

that the location of these laboratories be left open until the claims of the Pittsburg district can be brought before the Director of the Geological Survey.

EDWARD V. D'INVILLIERS,
GEOLOGIST AND MINING ENGINEER,
Philadelphia, Pa., May 28, 1906.

Hon. W. H. WILEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MAJOR WILEY: With reference to the fuel tests which have been conducted ever since the Louisiana Purchase Exposition at St. Louis by the Geological Survey, it gives me great pleasure to say that I think the continuance of this work is of the highest importance, not only to those who are engaged solely in professional work, like myself, but principally to the country at large, and the coal industry specifically.

Many of us may differ from time to time as to methods for compiling facts and deducing conclusions, but, nevertheless, there is a proper and well-founded belief that the methods pursued by the United States Geological Survey are at least free from any criticism as to favoritism or bias, and form the only possible standard for safe comparison, which an investigation of this kind demands.

I would therefore urge an enlargement of their appropriation and their means for carrying forward these investigations to a more finite and definite degree than has heretofore been possible, and I believe that the results which shall be derived therefrom will be regarded, within and without the United States, with more respect and confidence than would be secured by any other similar investigation.

Trusting that you may be in a position to still further aid this project, which I am sure you will feel has already given evidence of vigorous and lasting results of value, I am,

Very respectfully, yours,

E. V. D'INVILLIERS.

GEORGE W. HARRIS, MINING ENGINEER,
Beckley, W. Va., May 28, 1906.

Hon. W. H. WILEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have your kind inquiry as to my opinion relative to the importance of continuing the investigation of fuels, which has been conducted under the United States Geological Survey at their testing plant at St. Louis. I gladly avail myself of the privilege of expressing my views to you on a matter which I trust is only the initial step of such investigations. I particularly appreciate the splendid work commenced by those connected with the St. Louis experiment station, and would greatly regret its discontinuance.

Many new coal fields are being opened to-day, and reliable information about the coals of this country is in greater and greater demand, as regards their steaming, coking, and briquetting qualities.

Much has been written about the advantage of experiment stations, in which matters of the utmost importance to the mining interests could receive attention similar to the work carried on by the national and State agricultural institutions. Great Britain and the important mining continental countries have maintained for years experiment stations, which have made most important contributions to mining knowledge, while the United States, the world's largest producer of fuel, has, with the exception of the St. Louis plant, no establishment for experimental work.

I sincerely trust that the investigation of fuels may not only be continued, but that the scope of the St. Louis plant may be enlarged. Many mining problems await solution, and as a most timely illustration, I would respectfully call your attention to the numerous coal-mine explosions that have occurred in the United States within the last few years, and most recently the loss of life from that cause in West Virginia. Foreign countries have conducted experiments along the line of coal-dust explosions, among others, but further research seems to be necessary.

Thanking you for giving me this opportunity of communicating with you on this matter, I beg to remain,

Respectfully, yours,

GEO. W. HARRIS.

GEOLOGIC AND TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY,
COMMISSION OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Harrisburg, Pa., May 28, 1906.

The Hon. W. H. WILEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your request for an expression of opinion from me as to the importance of continuing the investigation of fuels, which has been conducted under the Geological Survey at St. Louis during the past two years, I can only say that I regard this work as among the most important conducted by the Government. The results already obtained have been extremely interesting and of great economic value to the fuel industry and manufacturing interest of the entire country; and the benefits to be derived are not confined to those States which are producers of coal. While it is true that we have large coal resources in this country, it is equally true that, at the present rate of consumption, these must soon become exhausted; and therefore the proper use of the fuel, so as to obtain its full power efficiency, should be ascertained as speedily as possible, and in no way can this be done except under the auspices of the United States Government. Our Government itself should have much interest in the matter, and especially in connection with the Navy Department. I sincerely hope that the recommendations of the Director of the United States Geological Survey will meet with that hearty response from the Members of Congress which the importance of the work so well justifies.

I have understood that should the testing plant now located at St. Louis, be moved to Pennsylvania—and Pittsburg seems to be the logical place for its location—Mr. Carnegie stands ready to contribute a large sum of money for its proper installation there. I can well commend the recommendations of the Director of the Survey to your favorable consideration.

Very truly, yours,

ANDREW S. MCCREATH, Commissioner.

WILKES-BARRE, May 28, 1906.

Hon. W. H. WILEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WILEY: In response to your request of the 26th instant, asking my opinion of the importance of continuing the investigation of fuels which has been conducted under the Geological Survey at St. Louis during the past two years, permit me to express my thor-

ough appreciation of the excellent work thus far done and to hope that the investigations will not only be continued, but extended to include more thoroughly both the eastern bituminous and anthracite regions.

There is great need for authoritative data in regard to coal which this investigation is admirably supplying, and I sincerely hope that there can be no question of Congress appropriating the necessary funds for its continuance.

Yours, very truly,

R. V. NORRIS, Consulting Engineer.

AMERICAN LOCOMOTIVE COMPANY,
Richmond, Va., May 28, 1906.

Hon. W. H. WILEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: In reply to your inquiry in regard to the value of the investigation of the relative heat values of coal of the United States, together with the investigation of structural material, I wish to say that data of this kind is of inestimable value to the users of coal and structural material.

Owing to the lack of data as to the relative heating value of different coals, users are entirely dependent on statements of the mines, without individual investigations, which in nearly all cases is impracticable, and consequently a great deal of money is lost by using fuel not adapted for the individual requirements.

The reports gotten out by the United States Geological Survey, in their Professional Paper No. 48, supplies a great deal of valuable information of this character, and it will be of material assistance not only in engineering circles, but to all engaged in manufacturing industries, if this work is extended and completed.

I trust that the Government will be able to see the importance of the work undertaken, and provide sufficient funds to carry it out in the way that it should be finished, as it would be an appropriation from which the country would derive a direct benefit.

Yours, truly,

V. Z. CRAVAREISTI, Shop Engineer.

PHILADELPHIA, May 28, 1906.

Hon. W. H. WILEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I trespass upon your time most briefly and only to express the sincere hope that the investigation of fuels under the United States Geological Survey at St. Louis may be continued.

To the country at large the results of this research work should be of immense value.

Yours, very truly,

WM. G. NEILSON.

BEECH CREEK COAL AND COKE COMPANY,
Patton, Cambria County, Pa., May 28, 1906.

Hon. W. H. WILEY, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reference to the question of the investigations of fuels which have been conducted under the Geological Survey at St. Louis during the past two years, we learn that the matter of continuing these investigations is in question.

We certainly believe that these investigations should be continued by all means. The use of fuel is receiving more attention than ever before, and scientific research and investigation has done much in this line as well as other lines that concern practical economic results.

Yours, very truly,

E. C. BROWN, Superintendent.

NEW YORK, May 28, 1906.

Hon. W. H. WILEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In response to your inquiry of the 26th instant, I take pleasure in saying that I have recently examined the final reports (Professional Paper No. 48) "on fuel investigations during 1904, as a result of a survey of fuels and structural materials, at the testing plant at St. Louis," sufficiently to be impressed by the accomplishments of this testing plant, and am consequently prompted to express the hope, as an interested engineer—a member of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers—that the Senate may act in a way to insure the continuance of these valuable investigations indefinitely.

In my judgment, any appropriation which the Senate may feel disposed to make to this end will be spent to an inestimable advantage.

Very respectfully,

W. W. NICHOLS.

COLONIAL IRON COMPANY,
Riddlesburg, Pa., May 28, 1906.

Hon. W. H. WILEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your inquiry, I beg to state that the investigation of fuels conducted under the direction of the United States Geological Survey at St. Louis during the last two years promises to be of very great value not only to the producer, but also to the consumer of coal and coke. The work already performed has been of considerable value, and it will be a great pity if it should cease.

Only such test can be carried on authoritatively by the Government. There is no private laboratory in existence where such tests can be made, nor would it pay for private parties to establish a plant of this kind; it is too expensive to erect, and requires men of long experience to operate it.

It is a work that the Government can only conduct, and the information and discoveries it will make leading to economy in many directions will add to the material wealth of the country.

Yours, respectfully,

WM. LAUDER, General Manager.

JOHNSTOWN, PA., May 28, 1906.

Hon. W. H. WILEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As you request an unbiased and independent opinion as to the value and importance of continuing the investigation of fuels, which have been conducted under the Geological Survey at St. Louis during the past two years:

I am deeply interested in this work from the fact of its comprehensive usefulness. It is designed to embrace the scientific and economic study of the several varieties of coals in the United States, exhibiting

their relative values for generating steam and for the manufacture of coke.

Only the United States can do this work. It alone can assemble trained scientists to do this testing of coal in an impartial way that will assure general acceptance from the producers and users of coal and its products.

Some isolated determinations have been made by companies and individuals, but these do not command the absolute confidence that the results of the St. Louis coal-testing plant will assure.

With the great expansion of the use of coal—in 1905 364,332,640 net tons—it becomes a matter of the utmost industrial importance to diffuse the knowledge of the adaptability of the several qualities of coal for steam making and for the manufacture of coke and its by-products—ammonia sulphate and tar.

The study of coals for the manufacture of coke is of vital importance from the fact of its rapid expansion and the exhaustion of the fields producing the best coals for coking without preparation by crushing and washing.

We are now in a period in this great manufacture when the several processes for the preparation of the secondary qualities of coal for the production of metallurgical coke is earnestly needed.

During 1904 22,035,292 net tons of coke were produced, requiring 35,256,467 net tons of coal. The years 1905 and 1906 will show a very large expansion of this industry.

The briquetting of coal screenings and of the large fields of lignites will be a most helpful study for this testing plant at St. Louis, and will be largely looked for by the coal producers in the East, and especially in the West.

I feel assured that this testing work is most valuable, as it covers the very genesis of our manufactures in the proper uses of the several varieties of coals, with determinations of the special coals that are adapted for the manufacture of coke.

With the experience already secured at the St. Louis testing plant during the two years of its valuable work, with its well-developed system of testing, it would be a great national loss to have it interrupted until its great industrial mission has been accomplished.

Very truly, yours,

JNO. FULTON, *Mining Geologist.*

E. R. CHAPMAN & Co., BANKERS AND BROKERS,
New York, May 28, 1906.

Hon. W. H. WILEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a coal producer, it seems to me important that the investigation of fuels, now being conducted by the Geological Survey at St. Louis, should be continued, and I trust you will favor legislation to this end. It seems to me that it is a matter of importance to all interests consuming coal, that chemical properties of the different coals produced in the United States should be absolutely settled and determined, particularly as the different coals vary so much in their efficiency.

I shall be glad at all times to do what I can to aid in securing the desired legislation.

Very truly, yours,

E. R. CHAPMAN.

EDITORIAL ROOMS, THE ENGINEERING MAGAZINE,
New York, May 28, 1906.

Hon. Wm. H. WILEY, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILEY: I am writing to you, not only in my own behalf, but in consequence of the opportunity which I have had as editor of the Engineering Magazine of sounding the opinion of the engineering profession in general regarding the great importance to the industries of the United States of the continuance of the work of the fuel-testing board of the Geological Survey so auspiciously commenced at the St. Louis Exposition.

There is no doubt that it would be a national misfortune if anything should occur to prevent the continuance of this important work, while there is no doubt that its completion will add greatly to the wealth of the country by demonstrating the commercial value of fuel deposits hitherto neglected. Already I have had inquiries from abroad regarding the practical developments of the use of lignites and brown coals for the generation of fuel gas, and there is every reason to believe that further developments in these and other valuable results will be extended by the continuance of the work of the board.

It would be a great mistake to cut short in this partially completed condition this investigation already hailed by the engineers of the country with so much satisfaction, and I trust that you will use every effort in your power to have the board continued and the necessary appropriations liberally made.

I am sending you, under another cover, a marked copy of the April issue of the Engineering Magazine, in which reference is made to this subject.

Yours, very truly,

HENRY HARRISON SUPLEE, *Editor.*

THE UNITED COKE AND GAS COMPANY,
New York City, May 28, 1906.

Hon. W. H. WILEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In response to your inquiry, would say we sincerely hope that you can see a way clear to continue the investigations of fuels during the coming year at the St. Louis laboratory. It is scarcely necessary to speak of the advantage of a complete knowledge of our own fuels. The report as far as completed is of great value to us as well as to any other users of coal and its products.

Yours, very truly,

THE UNITED COKE AND GAS COMPANY,
D. F. SCHNEIWIN, *Vice-President.*

MECKLENBURG IRON WORKS,
Charlotte, N. C., May 28, 1906.

Hon. W. H. WILEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your inquiry about the importance of continuing the investigations of fuel, begun at St. Louis under the direction of the Geological Survey, there can be, in my opinion, no doubt about

its importance. The results there obtained are already of service to those using coal in manufacturing. As they become known and are carried to an end, will be of more service and be more valued. Hoping that the appropriation for this work will be continued and increased, I am,

Yours, sincerely and respectfully,

JNO. WILKES.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 28, 1906.

Hon. W. H. WILEY,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. WILEY: In reply to your inquiry, I beg to say that the continuance of the fuel investigations by the United States Geological Survey should be of great importance to our people. No one will deny the value of such investigations when properly carried out, while the record of what has already been accomplished by the Survey in this direction shows how well it has been done. Granting all this, is the Government justified in continuing such work?

As you know, I am strongly opposed to the Government undertaking any work which can be done by private enterprise. Private fuel-testing plants already exist, and any coal operator can have his product tested. A testing plant supported by public money should not be permitted to compete with such private work, but what it should and can do is something very different.

"Good wine needs no bush;" prime coal needs no public assistance to demonstrate its qualities. Now, while many sections of our country are blessed with abundant supplies of excellent fuel, the greater part have no other local resources but inferior coals, lignites, or even peats. It is perfectly well known that by proper treatment these inferior fuels can, in the vast majority of cases, be rendered highly efficient, but this knowledge is of little value to the public unless it can be shown that the investigations in any given case give promise of commercial success. To do this requires that the work be done on a scale that no private enterprise would be justified in undertaking. For example, the lignite of a western district, now of little value, might by suitable treatment be made a valuable smelting material, but nobody is sufficiently interested in it to expend the money required to prove this. Peat also can be made far more valuable than most people think, but again there is not enough prospect of private profit.

Of course it must be understood that the work is to be confined to the investigation of the fuel resources of large areas; that it is only to blaze the way and to indicate the direction for profitable individual effort, and that then the Government should cease its action. Congress must determine the advisability of expending public money in this direction, but I feel sure that if the work is properly administered and confined to its legitimate limits the returns will amply justify the expenditure.

Very truly, yours,

THOMAS M. CHATAARD.

HENRY S. FLEMING, CONSULTING ENGINEER,
New York, May 28, 1906.

Hon. W. H. WILEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: With reference to the importance of continuing the investigation of fuels and carrying out the proposed investigation of all structural materials, I beg to inclose herewith a copy of a letter which I sent Mr. Walcott, acknowledging the published tests of fuel thus far made and which expresses my opinion of the value of the tests. If there is any way in which I could emphasize what I have said I would like to do so. I have been fortunate enough to receive from the Government very many of its publications and find them all most valuable in my work, and of all of them these fuel tests have a more practical and direct value than any. I heartily hope it may be possible to continue them.

Believe me, sincerely, yours,

H. S. FLEMING.

CHARLES D. WALCOTT,
Director United States Geological Survey, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I beg to acknowledge the receipt of Professional Paper No. 48, parts 1, 2, and 3, for which I thank you heartily. The work which has been done and is recorded in these papers is of the utmost value to every engineer, and, I think, of equal value to all who are engaged in any industry in which coal is used. You have carried out a work which no private individual could have done satisfactorily because both of its extent and that if such work was undertaken by an individual it could not have equal reference value, because whether or not there had been a preference shown for any coal or sample of coal the inclination would be to believe there had, and thus throw a shadow over the results given.

I so heartily appreciate the exceeding value of the data presented in these reports that I am at a loss to know how to express my acknowledgments and my earnest hope is that nothing may be allowed to interfere with the plans of your department for carrying out tests of structural materials. It is impossible for a layman to understand how essential it is for an engineer to have reference data covering every class of material and made by unbiased investigators. Without it we are compelled to rely largely on tests published in the transactions of the various societies, which have not the scope of yours.

I do not know of anything which is a more important aid to the industrial development of this country than the work your department is doing, and it is my earnest hope nothing may be allowed to interfere with your progress in these directions.

Believe me, sincerely, yours,

SYRACUSE, N. Y., May 28, 1906.

Hon. W. H. WILEY,
House of Representatives, Washington D. C.

DEAR SIR: At your request for the writer's opinion regarding the importance of continuing the investigation of fuels, which has been conducted under the Geological Survey at St. Louis during the past two years, I gladly respond, and would ask you to accept—as fully stating my views—a copy of my letter to our Congressman, Hon. M. E. DRISCOLL. I would like to add that since writing that letter to Congressman DRISCOLL and one also to Congressman DENBY (of Michigan), as well as bringing the same to the attention of Senators PLATT and DEWEY, I have conversed with a number of gentlemen who are deeply interested in mines and manufactures, and gathered from the conversations that all were unanimous in their opinion as to its being one

of the best investments the United States Government could make at this time.

Trusting the inclosure will serve the purpose intended, I beg to remain,

Yours, respectfully,
J. WM. SMITH,
Assistant General Manager the Solvay Process Company.

Heartily approved.

W. B. COGSWELL,
Vice-President and Managing Director.

Extracts from letters of prominent engineers and others.

No investigations have been undertaken in recent years by the Government that have such immediate and striking importance and bearing on the proper utilization of raw materials as the fuel tests now being conducted at St. Louis.

R. N. DICKMAN,
*Dickman & Mackenzie, Mining Engineers, Assayers,
Chemists, and Metallurgists, Chicago, Ill.*

We are most emphatically in favor of the appropriation. There is very meager information available concerning the values of the various fuels, except what can be learned from the producers, and the great variance in the tests, which are often made with incomplete facilities, have rendered same uncertain and unreliable. We hope the work will be allowed to progress, as the increasing knowledge of the values and uses of our fuels is adding greatly to the wealth of the country.

JAMES W. ELLSWORTH & CO.,
Cleveland, Ohio.

The investigation of fuels and structural materials by the Government have called forth a widespread interest among members of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, and I am sure that they are of very great importance to the country.

F. W. TAYLOR,
*President American Society of Mechanical Engineers,
Philadelphia, Pa.*

I consider this a very valuable work which should be continued. It will be of the utmost importance to the country generally.

KARL EILERS,
*American Smelters Securities Company,
Salt Lake City, Utah.*

I trust you will at all times bear in mind our desire to render you any assistance in our power in connection with this most important work.

JAS. J. HILL,
President Great Northern Railway Company, St. Paul, Minn.

I can not too strongly emphasize the importance of the work. It should be of the greatest value not only to the metallurgical, but to all the other manufacturing and the transportation industries of the country who have these data as to fuels.

HENRY M. HOWE,
*Professor, School of Mines, Columbian University, New York.
(The most eminent steel metallurgist in the United States.)*

I am heartily in favor of the continuance of the investigations, and consider the work already done on the subject of fuels to be of the greatest value to engineers and manufacturers and to all interested in fuel economy.

WM. H. KAVANAUGH,
*Assistant Professor Mechanical Engineering,
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.*

I am greatly interested in the work that the United States Geological Survey has been doing at St. Louis during the past three years. I sincerely hope that the Congress now in session will see fit to not only enlarge the scope of the work, but will support the undertaking liberally in a financial way. The work already done is of great value.

S. W. BEYER,
*Department of Geology and Mining Engineering,
Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.*

This work of investigation of fuels and structural materials is valuable, and should by all means be continued.

W. A. LATHROP,
*President Pennsylvania Coal and Coke Company,
Philadelphia, Pa.*

We believe it to be a very important matter that Congress should make the necessary appropriation to carry on the investigation of fuel and structural materials.

PICKANDS, MATHER & CO.,
Cleveland, Ohio.

As an architect, I desire to express my view as to the great importance and value of a thorough and systematic Government investigation of the strengths and other properties of building materials, and trust that Congress will not fail to make the modest appropriation asked for that purpose.

WM. G. OSGOOD,
Boston, Mass.

I deeply appreciate the importance of this work being continued, and it would be impossible for anyone to overestimate the value which continued investigation would mean to this nation.

J. WM. SMITH,
*SEMET SOLVAY COMPANY,
Syracuse, N. Y.*

I can not find terms strong enough to express my approval of this project. The wonder is that this work has not been done long ago and that it is not being done on a larger scale.

A. O. ELZNER,
*Secretary Cincinnati Chapter,
American Institute of Architects, Cincinnati, Ohio.*

The continuance of these investigations ought to be provided for by Congress, and the appropriations estimated for the next fiscal year ought certainly to pass.

AMERICAN METAL COMPANY (LIMITED),
J. LANGELOTH, *President.*

I thoroughly believe that this work should be continued. It is of inestimable value to the coal-using industries of the country.

G. W. BISSELL,
*Professor Mechanical Engineering, Iowa State College,
Ames, Iowa.*

I consider the work of vast importance to the commercial world and feel sure that it should, if possible, be continued.

NEW YORK EDISON COMPANY,
JAS. D. ANDREWS, *Chief Engineer,
55 Duane Street, New York.*

I believe these investigations will be of great benefit to the engineering fraternity of the country.

JOS. H. AMES,
*Chief Engineer American Car and Foundry Company,
Lincoln Trust Building, St. Louis, Mo.*

The importance of this work from an economic standpoint can scarcely be estimated. It reaches into all departments of industry where the question of fuel and power enters. The investigation is in the right direction, and we trust it will be continued.

E. C. BROWN,
*Superintendent Beach Creek Coal and Coke Company,
Patton, Cambria County, Pa.*

I regard the work done at the fuel-testing station as of the greatest possible value to all fuel users.

ALBERT A. CARY,
Member, A. S. M. E., etc., Mechanical Engineer, New York.

The work is of the greatest importance to the architectural profession, and I sincerely hope it may be continued.

F. W. CHANDLER,
*Professor of Architecture,
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston, Mass.*

This is an extremely valuable work, which can not fail to be of benefit to the entire country.

F. K. COPELAND,
President Sullivan Machinery Company, Chicago, Ill.

The tests are carefully made, and the results are invaluable and are accepted as standard.

S. E. FAIRCHILD, JR.,
*Fairchild & Gilchrist, Civil and Mining Engineers,
Philadelphia, Pa.*

Am greatly impressed with the value of this testing work, in its bearing on coals and cokes. This testing can be conducted only by the Government, with its qualified agents and ample resources.

JOHN FULTON,
Mining Geologist, Johnstown, Pa.

I hope the work will be continued and extended in its range. I can think of no more valuable and immediately useful service that the Survey could render the people of the United States than the continuance of this very successful work on fuels, etc.

R. D. GEORGE,
Professor of Geology, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.

I have not seen anything before in the nature of investigation which has been as thorough and complete as these investigations are.

W. P. HANCOCK,
*Superintendent Generating Department, Edison Electric
Illuminating Company of Boston, Boston, Mass.*

I hope the investigations will be continued. The United States is the only prominent coal-producing country that has no adequate knowledge of the properties of its fuels. The classifications based upon European data do not fit the great variety of our coals. Single States have done sporadic work to meet a few local industrial demands, but the question as a whole can be solved only by the General Government.

H. O. HOFMAN,
*Professor of Metallurgy, Massachusetts Institute of Technology,
Boston, Mass.*

The work of this department of the Geological Survey is of the greatest value to the engineers of the country, and I heartily recommend that the laboratories be continued with the fullest facilities.

ABRAM T. BALDWIN,
Syracuse, N. Y.

It is hoped that Congress may make the needed appropriations to continue these investigations.

RICKETTS & BANKS,
Per JOHN H. BANKS,
*Ricketts & Banks, Chemists, Assayers and Mining Engineers,
104 John street, New York.*

I am very much interested in this work and hope that liberal appropriations may be made for its continuance. The results will be of great interest to the country.

S. H. BROCKMEIR,
Mining Engineer for United States Brick Company, Catskill, N. Y.

Any investigation along lines that will teach economy in the value of fuels and structural materials, and especially any investigation of a local character, will undoubtedly prove of much benefit. Its economic importance can hardly be overestimated.

A. G. BROWNLEE,
President and General Manager Stanley Mines Company, Idaho Springs, Colo.

The question of comparative fuel values and the best methods of utilizing the different kinds of fuels is a matter of vital importance to everyone engaged in mining and the production and use of power, and the cost of such investigations is altogether too great to be borne by any one concern. Nor would the results receive the credence that would be given to results obtained under an independent national advisory board.

S. W. BRUNTON,
*The Taylor & Brunton Ore Sampling Co., Salt Lake City, Utah;
The Taylor & Brunton Sampling Co., Victor, Colo., etc.*

I sincerely hope Congress will see fit to extend the appropriations to enable the work to be carried to completion. The results obtained will be of material advantage.

V. Z. CARARRISTI,
Shop Engineer, American Locomotive Works, Richmond, Va.

The work will be of very great value, particularly to all interests producing or consuming fuel. It seems to me there ought to be no question of the propriety of the extension of this work for the next fiscal year.

S. R. CHAPMAN,
*President Chapman Iron, Coal, and Coke Co.,
80 Broadway, New York.*

The testing of fuels and structural materials is of great importance to both manufacturer and builder. The enormous waste through ignorance of material used can be largely overcome by a scientific knowledge of these matters. I add my word of enthusiastic support of this work.

W. M. CHAUVENET,
*Regis Chauvenet & Bro., Mining Engineers,
Analytical Chemists, etc., St. Louis, Mo.*

Such investigations are of the highest utility to engineers having charge of industrial operations, and I hope that Congress may supply abundant funds for the prosecution of these tests. May I suggest that the extension of the fuel tests to the classification of crude oils for use in gas engines would yield very important results?

COURTENAY DE KALB,
*Consulting Engineer, Exposed Treasure Mining Co.,
of Mojave, Cal. New York Office, 26 Liberty Street, New York.*

I am strongly in favor of a continuance of the investigations, and hope Congress may provide for an enlargement of their scope.

HENRY S. FLEMING,
Consulting Engineer, New York.

I desire to commend in the highest possible terms the work that is being done in the investigation of fuels and structural materials at this testing plant at St. Louis, and hope its great importance may be fully realized and that it may be continued for the good of the whole country.

GRANBY MINING AND SMELTING COMPANY,
St. Louis, Mo.,
Per ELIAS S. GATCH, *President.*

It is hoped these investigations will be continued under competent engineers, those who are in position to give an unbiased opinion. Our country should have better facilities for obtaining a knowledge of the materials used in engineering work. The expense of conducting a testing laboratory by manufacturing establishments is a great one. The means placed at the command of the German manufacturers by which results may be obtained at a slight cost is adding much to the competition with which American engineers have to contend.

ALBERT F. HALL,
*Member A. S. M. E., Associate Member Institute Civil
Engineers, England; Member Society Engineers in
Germany.*

I consider the investigations which your Bureau is carrying on of the greatest value to engineers and the engineering industries.

J. H. HOFFMAN,
*Hoffman Engineering and Construction Company,
Philadelphia, Pa.*

As a member of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, I wish to express my interest in the work that is being done in the investigation of fuels. I hope the appropriation for the continuance of the work may be obtained.

MAURICE HOOPES,
Glens Falls, N. Y.

The work of the coal-testing plant is of vital interest to the Engineers' Club. It is the desire of our organization to further the operations of the plant and the extension of their scope, and it was in order that we might do so intelligently and in a manner to be of the greatest usefulness to the public and to the plant that we appointed a committee which we regard as representative of the highest ideals of the Engineers' Club.

W. A. LAYMAN,
President Engineers' Club of St. Louis, St. Louis, Mo.

The influence of the published reports on fuel testing has been great. Even in the clay industries, in which I am particularly interested, in which the waste of fuel is proportionately greater than in any other industry, and which is slowest to take up advanced ideas, the report has had its effect.

Gas producers were eagerly discussed at the recent conventions of the American Ceramic Society and the National Brick Makers' Association, and a number of plants are putting them in. I sincerely hope the work will be continued and extended as proposed.

ELLIS LOVEJOY,
*Member American Ceramic Society, and of
American Institute of Mining Engineers, Columbus, Ohio.*

I trust that Congress will make liberal appropriations for the continuance of the investigations of fuels and structural materials, as this work is of the greatest importance to the country at large.

W. S. LYSLE, E. M.,
Rochester, N. Y.

I trust that the Survey may receive from Congress that recognition which the importance of the work well deserves.

ANDREW S. MCCREATH,
*Commissioner,
ANDREW S. MCCREATH & SON,
Harrisburg, Pa.*

I believe that the investigations should be pushed energetically.

W. T. MAGRUDER,
*Professor Mechanical Engineering,
Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.*

I shall endeavor to impress upon our Representatives the importance of the work and the fact that they should evince a larger interest therein.

W. F. R. MILLS,
General Manager, Mining Reporter, Denver, Colo.

I wish to express the hope as an interested engineer and a member of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, that the Senate may be sufficiently impressed by the accomplishments of this testing plant and the importance of its investigations to be willing to defray the expenses of such investigations by appropriations to be repeated indefinitely. In my estimation it will be money spent to inestimable advantage.

W. W. NICHOLS,
Allis-Chalmers Company, New York City.

I hope there can be no question of stopping appropriations for the very valuable work of the Geological Survey in testing fuels and building materials which has given us not only the best, but, in many cases, the only authoritative data on these subjects and greatly added in the economical use of building materials.

R. V. NORRIS,
Consulting Engineer, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

I have been informed of some move to discontinue the investigations of fuels and structural materials in the Survey. Please advise if I have not been misinformed. Surely no one would curtail the work of the Survey of such great importance as this if they appreciate the immense value of it to the mining public.

S. W. OSGOOD,
Chicago, Ill.

The importance of providing for the continuance of this desirable work is of such moment that I sincerely hope that the appropriation necessary for this purpose may be made by Congress.

CHARLES SCHUCHERT,
Curator Yale University Museum, New Haven, Conn.

Our company is very much interested in an appropriation for the continuance of the investigations of structural materials.

S. H. BASSETT,
President The Iola Portland Cement Company, Iola, Kans.

We are greatly interested in this work, and trust that the Government will see the advantage of providing funds for its continuance. The cement industry in particular has grown so enormously that we believe the Government alone can correct the tremendous amount of misinformation that has grown up respecting the use of cement.

H. J. SEAMAN,
*General Superintendent Atlas Portland Cement Company,
Northampton, Pa.*

We desire to express our hope that the investigations of the fuel and structural materials may be continued by the United States Geological Survey. There is a great need of such investigation concerning the efficiency of various fuels and the strength of various materials entering into construction, and such information will be of great value to the manufacturers and engineers of this country.

FRANK E. SHEPARD,
The Denver Engineering Works Company, Denver, Colo.

"Resolved, That we, the National Association of Cement Users, in convention assembled at Milwaukee, Wis., deem the investigation of cement, mortars, and other structural materials now being conducted by the United States Geological Survey of so far-reaching importance to the people of the country that we respectfully ask the Congress of the United States to make large provision for the continuance of this important work on a more extensive scale."

The foregoing resolution was passed by the National Association of Cement Users on January 10, 1906.

RICHARD L. HUMPHREY,
*President National Association of Cement Users,
Philadelphia, Pa.*

This work that is being done is of great assistance to all those engaged in work along these lines. It is to be hoped that the Senate will pass a resolution allowing this work to go on.

R. A. WEDDIEOMBE,
Kroeschell Bros. Boiler and Steel Fitting Works, Chicago, Ill.

From the intimate knowledge of the thoroughness and care with which the fuel tests are conducted at St. Louis, I sincerely hope that this work will be continued through a new Congressional appropriation. The results thus far obtained are of inestimable value, and it would be a grave misfortune if this work can not be continued.

H. A. WHEELER, *St. Louis, Mo.*

This work is of great public benefit, and I hope Congress will not cripple nor curtail the work of the Geological Survey, but will favor the continuance or expansion of the same.

EDWIN L. WILES,
Stony Point, N. Y.

I trust that Congress will make appropriations for the continuance of the investigation of fuels and structural materials.

JOHN WILKES,
Manager Mecklenburg Iron Works, Charlotte, N. C.

So far as I can judge, the results obtained are of great value and the investigation should be continued.

HENRY J. WILLIAMS,
Boston, Mass.

I would urge you to do all in your power to get sufficient funds appropriated to continue this work, as it is of great importance and much benefit will be derived from a continuance of these tests and investigations.

B. N. WILSON,
*Professor of Mechanical Engineering,
University of Arkansas, Fayette, Ark.*

I consider this report of extreme value and should regret to learn that it is to be discontinued.

R. S. PERRY,
*President and General Manager Harrison Brothers & Co. (Inc.),
Philadelphia, Pa.*

I desire to say it is my opinion that these investigations are very useful and should be continued. I believe the money is well spent which it costs to make them, and I hope Congress will make the necessary appropriation for the next fiscal year.

ERSKINE RAMSAY,
*Vice-President Pratt Consolidated Coal Company,
Birmingham, Ala.*

It is my hope that Congress will permit the continued work of the Survey on fuel investigations. The information that has been obtained by the tests at St. Louis have been of great commercial value.

GEORGE S. RICE,
Mining Engineer, Chicago, Ill.

I trust that the value of the work of the plant at St. Louis will be made apparent to Congress and that ample appropriations for the purpose will insure the continuation of the work for some time to come.

F. SCHNEIWIN,
*The United Coke and Gas Company,
New York City.*

I am very much interested in the work which has been conducted at St. Louis during the past year and believe that Congress should appropriate sufficient funds to continue the work on a larger scale.

M. S. SHERMAN,
*Superintendent Sement-Solvay Co.,
Ensley, Ala.*

I am impressed very favorably with the idea that the investigation of fuels and structural materials by the United States Geological Survey should be continued.

A. M. SHOOK,
Nashville, Tenn.

We believe that many and great benefits will accrue to the American people by a more general understanding of the scientific principles upon which the economical use of fuel is based.

J. D. SKINNER,
*President The Northern Coal and Coke Company,
Denver, Colo.*

I sincerely hope that the Government may make appropriations so that this exceedingly valuable work may continue.

ALBERT W. SMITH,
Director Sibley College, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

I consider the continuance of the investigation of fuels and structural materials by the Geological Survey to be of vital importance to the United States in general.

J. A. SNEDAKER,
Mining Engineer, Denver, Colo.

I am in favor of the continuance of the work of testing fuels and structural materials.

H. H. SUPLEE,
Editor The Engineering Magazine, New York City.

I am satisfied that the work of testing fuels and structural materials by the National Government can be made of great value to the people, and I am in favor of having the organization made permanent, with sufficient appropriations granted to obtain the service of the right kind of men.

R. M. TABLETON,
New York City.

Among the engineers who are familiar with what is being done at the testing plant at St. Louis this is regarded as the most important work that the Government has undertaken, and one which not only

gives valuable scientific information, but will bring the greatest practical good to the country. I wish to add my commendation of the work.

ARTHUR THACHER, E. M.,
St. Louis, Mo.

We are very much interested in these investigations and think they will be useful not only to us, but to the community at large.

E. N. TRUMP,
General Manager The Solvay Process Co., Syracuse N. Y.

I warmly indorse the work of your Department and trust Congress may provide for a continuance of the investigations.

EDWARD V. D'INVILLIERS,
Geologist and Mining Engineer, Philadelphia, Pa.

The work is proving of much value to the industries of the country.

JOHN P. JACKSON,
*Professor of Electrical Engineering,
Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa.*

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. GROSVENOR having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 18330. An act transferring the county of Clinton, in the State of Iowa, from the northern judicial district of Iowa to the southern judicial district of Iowa;

H. R. 17983. An act providing for the erection of a monument on Kings Mountain battle ground, commemorative of the great victory gained there during the war of the American Revolution, on October 7, 1780, by the American forces;

H. R. 13543. An act for the protection and regulation of the fisheries of Alaska; and

H. R. 13372. An act to authorize the sale of timber on certain of the lands reserved for the use of the Menominee tribe of Indians, in the State of Wisconsin.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 19642. An act to regulate the keeping of employment agencies in the District of Columbia where fees are charged for procuring employment or situations.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 1816. An act for the relief of the Citizens' Bank of Louisiana;

S. 1812. An act for the relief of Lieut. James M. Pickerell, United States Navy, retired;

S. 6256. An act to authorize the Lake Schutte Cemetery Corporation to convey lands heretofore granted to it;

S. 5901. An act to extend the time for the completion of the Alaska Central Railway, and for other purposes;

S. 5418. An act relinquishing the title of the United States to certain land in the city of Pensacola, Fla., to James Wilkins;

S. 3469. An act to extend the provisions of the act of June 27, 1902, entitled "An act to extend the provisions, limitations, and benefits of an act entitled 'An act granting pensions to the survivors of the Indian wars of 1832 to 1842, inclusive, known as the Black Hawk war, Cherokee disturbances, and the Seminole war,'" approved July 27, 1902; and

S. 3413. An act to prevent cruelty to animals while in transit by railroad or other means of transportation from one State or Territory or the District of Columbia into or through another State or Territory or the District of Columbia, and repealing sections 4386, 4387, 4388, 4389, and 4390 of the United States Revised Statutes.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

For topographical surveys in various portions of the United States, \$300,000, to be immediately available.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order to that paragraph.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 75, line 20, amend by adding, after the word "hundred," the words "and fifty."

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be considered as pending and read for the information of the committee in the time of the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply restores

the appropriation to the amount in the current law, \$350,000. I think it is not necessary to impress upon the members of the House the relative importance of topographic surveys among the whole work of the Geological Survey. It is such work as is preliminary to much of the other work of that Survey. All investigations of mineral resources, of forest resources, of soil survey, made by the Department of Agriculture and various other works are dependent upon the preliminary topographic maps made by the Geological Survey. It is naturally important, therefore, that the topographic survey should precede and be largely in advance of the other work of the service. There is now no such advance as will justify Congress in curtailing this appropriation, and therefore curtailing the work. There is no more popular feature of the work of the Geological Survey than that involved in this paragraph. Demands have come from every State and Territory in the Union, and as the director in his report says, a much larger sum than that contained in the current appropriation and that which is intended by this amendment could be utilized and then the wishes of the country, as reflected by their Representatives here, not be met. I take it, therefore, it is unnecessary to take up the time of the House in any discussion of the merits of this amendment, the only purpose of which is to make the appropriation equal to the appropriation in the current law, \$350,000, instead of \$300,000, as reported by the committee and contained in the bill.

Mr. McKINLAY of California rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, do I understand that a point of order is pending?

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved against the paragraph. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] offered an amendment, which was read in his time, but which would of course not be considered as pending until the point of order reserved by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] was determined.

Mr. SHERLEY. Is it in order to demand that the point of order be made or withdrawn?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that it is.

Mr. SHERLEY. Then I shall insist that the point be made or withdrawn. This may go out on a point of order, and we would like to have the Chair's ruling upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state, however, to the gentleman from Kentucky that before his point was made and while the point of order was pending the Chair had recognized the gentleman from California [Mr. McKINLAY].

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TAWNEY. In the event that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] withdraws his point of order to the paragraph, does the point of order still lie to the amendment which I have reserved, which amendment was offered by the gentleman from North Carolina?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will again state that under the parliamentary situation the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina was simply read in his time and is not now pending.

Mr. TAWNEY. What I want to ascertain is whether in the event of the withdrawal of the point of order to the paragraph I can then insist upon my point of order as against the amendment increasing the appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; the gentleman from Minnesota can make the point of order.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the point of order lie?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks not. The amendment simply increases the amount.

Mr. TAWNEY. Then, Mr. Chairman, the only way in which we can avoid this would be to have a ruling on the point of order made by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Chair if I understood the Chair aright in stating that the point of order had to be made or withdrawn whenever the regular order was called for?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; but the Chair understood the gentleman from Kentucky to rise to a parliamentary inquiry or to make a point of order, and before he made the point or rose to a parliamentary inquiry the Chair had recognized the gentleman from California for five minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. I have no desire to take the gentleman off his feet.

Mr. McKINLAY of California. Mr. Chairman, all that portion of the sundry civil bill dealing with the appropriations for the maintenance of the Geological Bureau is of vital importance to the entire State of California, but particularly so to that re-

gion of the State occupied by the valleys of the San Joaquin and Sacramento rivers.

This section of the bill is peculiarly important to northern California, because of the fact that the items of this portion of the bill have been cut down far below the estimates of the Bureau of Geological Survey, the item of appropriation for topographical work alone having been scaled by the committee \$100,000. This item, at least, we contend should be raised in the bill, so that it shall read \$400,000 instead of \$300,000.

I firmly believe that if the Members of this House will give some consideration to the magnitude and importance of the work now being carried on in all sections of the United States by this very efficient and useful department of the Government, they will come to the same conclusion I have—that the increase of this item, which is now \$300,000, to \$400,000 is not too much to ask for and expect to receive.

Gentlemen, the work of this Department of the Government is not confined to any one State nor any one section. Every State and Territory of the Union is being surveyed and studied, and in a measure developed by the engineers and scientists of the Geological Bureau. Therefore every Member of the House is interested in having sufficient funds placed at the disposal of the Director of this Bureau for the aggressive continuance of the work now being prosecuted under his direction.

The restoration of all the amounts cut from the estimates of Mr. Walcott is not too much to ask for, for the restoration of those amounts means the continuance in an efficient way of geological survey, topographical survey, stream measurement, and chemical and physical research relative to geology, in all parts of the Republic.

The engineers and scientific men of this Bureau are now scattered over the entire area of the country. They are doing good, valuable work, work that must be done before the lands in the various States and Territories still in the ownership of the Federal Government shall be ready for settlement, occupation, or sale, as the case may be, under the various laws by the provisions of which the public lands may be acquired by private persons.

It is not as though the Geological Bureau were asking increased funds to experiment with along new lines. The lines of work of the Geological Bureau are already set. Their plans have been in operation for years and are still under way, and all the Bureau asks is that that work shall be continued along the lines projected.

Now, as this is a necessary work, useful and profitable to every State of the Union, it should be indorsed, supported, and encouraged by every Member of this House. And the only way this can be done is by the restoration to the sundry civil bill the amounts scaled down from the estimate of the Bureau.

Last year the approved estimates of the Bureau amounted to \$350,000, and that was almost an insufficient amount to meet the demands upon the Bureau; and the demands are daily increasing rather than diminishing, so that to keep pace with those increasing demands, to continue the work falling under the supervision of the Geological Bureau and maintain it in its old ratio in proportion to the calls upon the Bureau from many new quarters, it is necessary that the amount the Bureau should have placed at its disposal this year should be \$400,000.

Now, the reduction of the fund for topographical survey works a peculiar hardship at this time upon northern California, throughout all the region drained by the San Joaquin and Sacramento rivers, for in those regions topographic, hydrographic, and geological work have been carried on for some years. Reconnaissance surveys have been made over almost the entire extent of the two river basins, and working surveys already extend over a great portion of the Sacramento basin, and the continued prosecution and quick completion of those surveys means everything to the district I have the honor to represent.

Now, gentlemen, do not assume that if the sum of \$100,000 is restored to this item of the sundry civil bill it all goes to northern California, or even to all California. The portion of the entire amount which will go to California will be about twenty or twenty-five thousand dollars, the remainder of the amount being divided up among other States. Texas, Georgia, Illinois, New York, Ohio, Montana, Washington, Oregon, and, in fact, every State in which geological work is being prosecuted will share with California.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. McKINLAY of California. Certainly.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I would like to ask the gentleman how he knows \$20,000 of that will go to California?

Mr. McKINLAY of California. Because last year about \$20,000 of the fund was expended and this year, I think, \$15,000,

and I am basing my estimate of \$20,000 for the future year's work upon the amount which has been expended in the past.

But the peculiar hardship to California arising out of the scaling down of the estimates of the Bureau comes from the fact that the surveys in the valleys of California are nearly completed. One more year's work will finish them. The twenty or twenty-five thousand dollars which would be apportioned to our State, when supplemented by a like sum furnished by California herself, would be sufficient to bring to a successful conclusion an all-important work—a work the completion of which means everything to that portion of our State.

This work of the Geological Bureau throughout our valleys has been varied, extensive, and very necessary.

The hydrographic work now in progress in those valleys consists of stream gauging, the study of underground waters, the study of the quality of the water, and the study of the debris problem and its relation to hydraulic mining. And let me say in passing that the debris problem was, and is, one of the most disturbing questions that has ever agitated California, and a question that is still far from settlement or solution.

The topographic work is in the nature of the location and survey of irrigation reservoir sites, drainage and irrigation canal courses, location of storage basins for waste waters, and all such necessary work as must be done in the preparation of vast and comparatively little understood tracts of land, when preparing them for successful cultivation under a proposed irrigation system.

The continuance of this work is most necessary. Why, its cessation would be a calamity to the State of California; not only that, but it would be against the interests of the people of the whole country to have this work terminated.

Perhaps this may seem like an extravagant statement, but consider the facts. Although the work I have indicated is being carried on within the State lines of California, nevertheless the Federal Government still owns over 10 per cent of all the lands lying in the counties of Tehama, Lake, Glenn, Colusa, and Yolo, on the west side of the Sacramento River. Why, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government still owns or controls more than half of the lands within the entire area of the State of California.

That magnificent empire of the Pacific slope, containing 99,000,000 acres of land, twelve hundred miles of seaboard—if the indentations of the coast are followed—the greatest harbor in all the world, unbounded resources, and endless possibilities of industry, commerce, manufacture, and productive enterprise of every description, one-half of all this is still in the ownership or under the control of the General Government of the United States.

To whose interest and advantage is it, then, that the work of surveying, studying, planning for, and understanding California shall be continued? To California alone? No. It is to the interest and advantage of all the people—the whole people of the whole country.

Far too great a portion of the public domain—the people's land—has already been thoughtlessly, ignorantly, and wantonly conveyed away. Lands containing vast deposits of minerals of untold value; lands covered with tracts of timber of almost fabulous price; lands possessed of water, springs, and streams of incalculable value; lands upon which reservoir sites and rapids suitable for the generation of power are located by nature have been recklessly given to persons and corporations for but a fraction of their value, because the Government itself did not know the value of the rich agencies of wealth and usefulness it was scattering with a far too lavish hand.

But the General Government has at last turned over a new leaf in this respect, and it wants to know all about its possessions. It wants to know the value of the land, the water, the timber, the minerals, and even the sands, rocks, and climate it intends to hereafter dispose of. And so that it may understand all these things, so that a fund of all such information shall be easily available, the Geological Bureau has been intrusted with the work of gathering information of every nature, information equally valuable to the Government and the private citizen.

Now, that is the work that the Geological Bureau is carrying on not only in California, but all over the country, and the work which we Californians protest against bringing to even a partial conclusion for the want of sufficient funds to bring it to a thorough completion.

Nor has California been backward on her part. She has year by year appropriated sums to be spent in equal amount to that spent by the Federal Government within her boundaries, all sums, both State and Federal, being expended by the United States officials for the carrying forward of Geological Bureau work of every description. Last year she contributed twenty thousand, this year fifteen, in cooperation with the Federal

Government, and I am sure she will continue to meet every requirement of the work of the Geological Bureau, so necessary to her development.

So much has been done already of usefulness and profit by the cooperation of State and nation—so much toward the solution of the drainage problem, the irrigation problem, the debris problem—that it would be a shame and disgrace to both State and nation if all this important work should be suspended, the engineers recalled, the scientific men withdrawn, the records, plans and specifications shelved away to mold and be forgotten, and all the work fall into desuetude for the want of a few paltry thousand dollars, which here and now should be restored to the sundry civil bill. And if this should be done—as it ought to be done—be assured of this, Mr. Chairman, that California on her part will pay back to the General Government in the saving of future expense and in the profits of enlarged opportunities \$10 for every one she shall receive.

The maintenance of the navigability of the Sacramento River has been for many years a large item of expense which the Federal Government has been compelled to consider. Congress after Congress has been importuned by California Members to grant moneys for the purpose of dredging bars, removing shoals and other obstructions, building weirs and wing dams, so that a reasonable state of navigability might be maintained along the course of this the great artery of northern California's inland commerce, and on the whole Congress has reasonably responded to the solicitations of California along this line.

But notwithstanding the large sums expended, despite the fact that great improvements have been made in the river course as a result of these expenditures, the problem of the control and reclamation of the Sacramento River is still a most vital question, affecting all the valley territory extending from Suisun Bay to the mountain slopes at the head of navigation north of the town of Red Bluff, a distance of over 250 miles.

To understand the intricacies of the Sacramento River problem of the present it is necessary to be acquainted with the fact that in Argonaut days navigation was comparatively easy and unimpeded along the entire river course from its mouth to the mountain rapids. In those days the Sacramento was the highway of northern California commerce and the chief agency for the distribution of people, products, and merchandise to all parts of that section of the State. Old settlers still remember when ocean-going vessels were tied to Sacramento city docks, and cargoes loaded or unloaded that found a passage "round the Horn."

But the use of the hydraulic monitor in mining operations in the foothills of California soon began to fill the tributary streams with refuse and debris of the mines, and this, being carried by currents and floods, found its way to the mother stream, and in time began to change the whole character of the water courses impregnated with it. Great deposits of debris began to fill the beds of the streams and find lodgment against obstructions, forming bars, shoals, and islands, and in many places completely changing the topography of the country.

The Federal Government finally found it necessary to prohibit hydraulic mining, but the prohibition in a great measure came too late. The Sacramento River was almost ruined as a navigable river, and all the tributaries entirely so. The Yuba, the Feather, and the American rivers, emptying into the Sacramento, became almost worthless from a navigable standpoint.

The filling up of the beds of the streams caused, of course, an increased danger of overflow in time of high water. A great danger to life and property each year arose from this changing condition of river and streams. To offset the growing tendency to inundation the landowners along the banks of the streams were compelled to build levees to confine the waters, and this levee building has never ceased to this hour. The work has gone on year after year, the rivers filling, the levees growing higher and higher, and each year the danger of winter's floods increasing. As a result of this filling and building, in places the beds of streams are 12 and 15 feet higher than the adjacent fields.

This condition might not be so very alarming in a sparsely settled country, but the rich lands of the Sacramento River bottom are attracting a large and ever-increasing population, and consequently year by year the menace to life and property along the Sacramento increases.

The Federal Government has taken cognizance of these conditions, and, I believe, at times has even stretched a point in the way of making liberal appropriations for maintaining the navigability of the river, in order that incidentally such work might be done in the expenditure of the appropriation as would tend to mitigate the evils arising out of the river's impairment by the mining debris.

In 1904 a serious break of the levee, just below the city of

Sacramento, permitted the inundation of nearly 60 miles of lands, a great portion of which were under cultivation, and as a result fully \$10,000,000 worth of property was destroyed.

Both the State of California and the Federal Government have been working for years upon various plans to eradicate the evils growing out of the tendency of the Sacramento River to overflow its banks. Commissions of engineers have been appointed by both Federal and State governments to study the problem and, if possible, formulate a plan whereby the evils might be overcome.

A very comprehensive plan has been outlined by a commission appointed a few years ago, and in all probability, if the details of that plan could be successfully worked out, the Sacramento River could be confined within its banks, and incidentally great tracts of overflowed lands drained and brought into a condition fit for cultivation, but the completion of the work under that plan would require an expenditure of \$24,000,000. And at the present time neither the State of California nor the landholders of the valley are in a position to expend the amounts which would fall to their respective lots to pay, even if the Federal Government would cooperate with the State of California and the landholders in carrying out the plans of the engineers.

Meanwhile the people of that great valley are in constant apprehension that each recurring winter's floods will sweep away the levees and carry death and destruction to thousands of homes.

Now, strange to say, the passage of the reclamation act of June 17, 1902, came as a star of promise to the people of the Sacramento Valley. Under the provisions of that act a fund should be created out of the proceeds of the sale of public lands, this fund to be expended in the building of storage dams, irrigation canals, and ditches, by means of which the waters of winter might be impounded and stored till the season of summer and then distributed to the thirsty lands within the limits of irrigation districts.

Although the provisions of this act were intended to apply primarily to arid lands in Government ownership, still the scope of the law was not absolutely confined to Government lands. Under its provisions private owners of lands, under the direction of the Reclamation Service Bureau, may dedicate their lands in acreages not to exceed 160 acres by each owner to an irrigation district corporation, and if an aggregate expanse sufficiently large is so dedicated to the corporation, the Secretary of the Interior may cause to be built suitable storage reservoirs and canals and furnish water to the members of the district corporation, the money advanced by the Government to become a lien upon the land of the district until paid, which payment may be made in ten yearly installments, the works then to become the property of the district corporation. In this way, under the provisions of the reclamation act, it is designed that the reclamation fund shall become a revolving fund, and decade after decade perform its beneficent purpose.

Now, the people of the Sacramento Valley were quick to perceive the possibilities of this wise law; perhaps their perception was quickened by the fact that long since much of their land has become partially exhausted from successive years of wheat raising. Year by year the yield has been decreasing, until in many sections the annual return of the land when planted to wheat is not sufficient to maintain the landowner.

So from every part of that great valley a desire was expressed that irrigation be inaugurated under the provisions of the reclamation law.

Students of the river problem saw in the possibility of irrigation under the reclamation law a practical solution of the river problem. With the construction of storage dams on the courses of the various streams emptying into the Sacramento River engineers saw the possibility of holding back a great portion of the flood waters in time of excess and gradually letting them escape as the river flow subsided; then, as the months of drought approached, permitting the reservoirs to fill for the purpose of storing the water for use in irrigation.

Therefore the development of the irrigation systems, the regulation of flood waters, and the drainage and reclamation of land will insure the comparatively easy preservation of the navigability of the Sacramento River. After the passage of the reclamation law the engineers of the Reclamation Service, in making reconnaissance surveys over California, discovered the immense possibilities of the Sacramento from the irrigation standpoint, and every succeeding day's study of that remarkable valley more strongly confirmed the opinion that the Sacramento Basin is the most promising field for successful irrigation operations in the whole United States.

So enthusiastic are the Government officers engaged in surveying the Sacramento Valley that they are very anxious to

complete the necessary work, so that very soon the entire valley shall be prepared for the formation of irrigation districts and the prosecution of work under the reclamation law.

The great Sacramento Valley is 400 miles in length and has an average width of about 40 miles. It has an area of more than two and a half million acres, all of which is susceptible of some degree of irrigation, and this vast tract of most fertile land as yet contains a population of much less than a half million people.

The records of the census of 1900 show that this Nile Valley of California produces more than 80 per cent of the wheat crop of the State, more than 60 per cent of the barley, 57 per cent of the onions, and 55 per cent of the potatoes. This valley raises citrus fruits, deciduous fruits, and grapes. In fact, all products of the temperate and semitropical climates are there grown.

This wonderful valley, even under partial irrigation, within twenty years should furnish homes and plenty to more than 5,000,000 souls. Already the progressive citizens in the vicinity of the thriving town of Orland, in Glenn County, have caught the spirit of progress and have organized themselves into an irrigation district, known as the "Orland Water Users' Association." They have dedicated sufficient land to meet the requirements of the reclamation law, and under the direction of a former Member of this House, who was, as well, a member of the Irrigation Committee, the Orland association is endeavoring to proceed according to the plan outlined in that act. They are endeavoring, by the timely use of water, to save their lands and their homes to themselves and their children, and in doing so they are furnishing a valuable example to the people of other semiarid districts, that will, without doubt, be most profitable for them to follow.

But the necessary surveys are as yet incomplete. The plans, the specifications, and the estimates are as yet unfinished, and the Geological Bureau asks funds to complete the work. Without sufficient funds—yes, even without the additional \$100,000 we are now importuning the House to add to the estimate of the committee for topographical survey—the work of completing the plans must cease, at least till a more generous House will furnish the means to meet the requirements of the situation.

But surely the plea of the Geological Bureau and of the people of California will be granted and their hope not denied. This Congress, which gave most generously when unparalleled disaster devastated California, will not close its hand in a sudden paroxysm of false economy, and, in order to recoup liberality in other places, bring to a standstill even a portion of the work now being carried on under the direction of the Geological Bureau in the Sacramento Valley.

Let me say again, in conclusion, this is a whole United States project—this mapping out, surveying, and preparing for irrigation the California lands. It is a work which vitally concerns all the people of the Union, for it is the making ready for the welcome of millions who will some day find homes in California.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 19264) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. HALE, Mr. CULLOM, and Mr. TELLER as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 4250) to further enlarge the powers and authority of the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service and to impose further duties thereon.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 18536) providing for the subdivision of lands entered under the reclamation act, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. ANKENY, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. DUBOIS as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2188) granting to the city of Durango, in the State of Colorado, certain lands therein described for water reservoirs, had asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two

Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. CARTER, Mr. FLINT, and Mr. PATTERSON as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9813) granting a pension to Harriet P. Sanders.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 10715) to establish an additional collection district in the State of Texas, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. ELKINS, Mr. HOPKINS, and Mr. CLAY as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 6176. An act providing for pay of expenses of district judges.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. SHERLEY rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kentucky rise?

Mr. SHERLEY. I simply rise to ask the parliamentary status. I understand the point of order has been reserved on this section. I insist that the point be made or withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the remark of the gentleman?

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], as I understood, reserved the point of order pending the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKINLAY]. Now, I understand the regular order is either the making of the point or order or the withdrawal of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks not. The Chair thinks the gentleman has the right to reserve the point of order pending discussion.

Mr. SHERLEY. The former Chairman ruled just the contrary—the predecessor of the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say if anybody demands—

Mr. SHERLEY. I do demand it. I demand the regular order.

Mr. STAFFORD. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can another gentleman, as, for instance, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], make the point of order if he so desires, the point of order having been reserved by another gentleman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin has reserved the point of order, as the Chair understands.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. He does that only by unanimous consent. If anyone objects to that and demands that the point of order be made, then the gentleman must either make it or withdraw it, and if the gentleman withdraws it, the gentleman from Kentucky may renew it, if he sees fit to do so.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] insist on his point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do I understand the alternative now as presented to me is to either withdraw the point of order or make it? Or can not I be recognized to speak to the merits of the proposition as I see fit?

The CHAIRMAN. Not when a decision is demanded.

Mr. STAFFORD. I reserved the point of order for the purpose of obtaining some information concerning this paragraph. I suppose that can be done in the regular way, by moving to strike out. So I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, may we know what the point of order is? Some of us were unable to hear it.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is on the paragraph, the Chair will state to the gentleman.

Mr. OLMSTED. What is the point of order?

Mr. KEIFER. There is some confusion as to what this is.

The CHAIRMAN. Lines 19, 20, and 21, page 75. The point of order is on the paragraph. An amendment was offered and the point of order made to the amendment.

Mr. KEIFER. On what ground?

The CHAIRMAN. The present occupant of the chair was not here at the time.

Mr. OLMSTED. What we would like to know is, if the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] will state what this point of order is. We understand from the Chair against what paragraph it is made, but do not know what the point of order is.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. It is on page 75, lines 19, 20, and 21.

Mr. OLMSTED. What is the point?

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. The point is that it is new legislation and not authorized by law. I suppose it is practically covered by the Chair's previous ruling.

Mr. OLMSTED. We do not think so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is quite willing to hear the gentleman from Massachusetts on that proposition, also any other gentleman who desires to argue it.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I understand that the topographical survey is authorized only by the same statute which was appealed to to uphold a provision for gauging streams. That is my understanding of the law, namely, that that is the only basis for this topographical survey. And if that is so, of course the ruling of the Chair upon gauging streams would apply also to this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. OLMSTED. Very briefly. The survey part, as I understand, the important part against which the point of order was originally made by the gentleman from Indiana, was withdrawn, and the point of order upon which the Chair passed had relation only to gauging streams and determining water supply, for which the Chair ruled there was no authority of law either in the public domain or anywhere else. But this paragraph covers topographical surveying throughout the United States. I think it to be a fact that will not be disputed that this is a Government work in progress. It has been appropriated for year after year, and there are at this moment men at work, actually on the ground, doing tangible, actual work in a dozen different States of the Union. It is clearly as much a Government work as continuing the location of boundary lines or the completion of a list of claims—private claims—against the United States, both of which have been held to be Government works in progress.

The rule of this House requiring previous authority of law as the basis of an appropriation expressly excepts appropriations in continuation of "such public works and objects as are already in progress."

Now, here is an actual, tangible thing. It is a tangible work, and a work in actual progress, making a topographical survey of the United States. There is a map spread out before us that shows the extent to which it has been already accomplished from one coast to the other. Surveying has within the past three years, as the hearings before the committee show, been in progress in forty-five States. It will not be disputed that there are thousands of men at work in the field now on that very work. Therefore I say that this is for the continuation of a Government work in progress, and therefore within the exception to the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin desire to be heard?

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not desire to discuss that phase of the point of order covered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but I would like to present a suggestion as to whether this topographical work is covered by the original law. The Chair construed the same provision of the act in passing upon the point of order just passed upon. There is nothing in the substantive law creating this Bureau that authorizes a topographical survey. There is in the section phraseology that will permit a geological survey; and I wish to call the Chair's attention to the distinction between a topographical survey and a geological survey. A topographical survey is in no wise incident to a geological survey, but entirely separate and distinct, as is borne out by the testimony of the Chief of the Geological Survey in the hearings before the committee. The work of a topographical survey is entirely apart and distinct from a geological survey and in no wise dependent upon it. As the Chair well knows, and as this committee knows, so far as that is concerned, topographical surveys are surveys of the surface. A geological survey is a survey of the substratum, beneath the surface, and has nothing whatever to do with the topographical survey.

I wish to call the Chair's attention to the limited phraseology in the original act, which says that this officer "shall have direction of the geological survey," not topographical survey, "and the classification of the public lands." The mere fact that he has authority to classify public lands does not give him authority to make a topographical survey, because the classification of the public lands has no relation to a topo-

graphical survey. A topographical survey is entirely separate and apart. I read the language that immediately follows:

An examination of the geological structure, mineral resources, and products of the national domain.

There is nothing involved in that phraseology, "examination of the geological structure, mineral resources, and products of the national domain," that would authorize him to have a survey made of the surface. I contend there is nothing dependent and conditional upon a geological survey that can imply an authority to have a topographical survey made. Therefore, I believe the point of order should be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. KEIFER. I do. If I understood the gentleman from Wisconsin, he concedes that if this is a part of the geological survey, then his point of order is not good. Is that right?

Mr. STAFFORD. The point I make is that in no way is a geological survey connected with a topographical survey.

Mr. KEIFER. I understood you to concede that if it was a part of the geological survey, then your point of order is not good.

Mr. STAFFORD. My whole argument was, and I am very sorry I did not convey it to the distinguished gentleman, that a topographical survey was separate and distinct from a geological survey, and therefore there is no authority to make a topographical survey.

Mr. KEIFER. I do not care to have the gentleman repeat the statement. If a topographical survey is an essential part of the geological survey, as we will soon see, or if it is any part of a geographical survey, then the gentleman's point of order is not well taken.

Now, let us see whether we are in any trouble about that. This is a very important question, and covers other important matters and should be carefully considered. This clause provides for the appropriation of \$300,000, to be immediately available, for topographical surveys in various portions of the United States. Now, Mr. Chairman, let us see whether a topographical survey is a geographical survey within the meaning of the law. It is, unless the Appropriations Committee, which drew this bill, was entirely mistaken, and unless every other committee and every other Congress making appropriations hitherto of like kind were utterly mistaken. Let us see. I desire the attention of the Chair to this point, for it is the basis of my objection to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is hearing the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KEIFER. I call attention to page 75 of the bill. In capitals we find the words "For general expenses of the Geological Survey," in line 4; then a colon. Now, I read further:

For the Geological Survey and the classification of the public lands and examination of the geological structure, mineral resources, and the products of the national domain—

And so forth. Going down toward the close of that paragraph:

Including telegrams, furniture, stationery, telephones, and all other necessary articles required in the field, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, namely—

That is, the Geological Survey, namely:

For pay of skilled laborers and various temporary employees, \$20,000. For topographical surveys in various portions of the United States, \$300,000, to be immediately available.

All these things are connected with the Geological Survey, and are so designated in the bill. The phrase "Geological Survey" is not a mere name which indicates and defines that it is only to be confined to the science purely of geology, but it includes all things that are appropriately placed here under that head. So the topographical survey is put here under the head of the Geological Survey, and so are many other things so indicated in the bill.

Now, if we may appropriate for a Geological Survey, then we may appropriate for this branch of the Geological Survey, as we have been doing hitherto. I do not agree that it is necessary that when we are making an appropriation for the continuance of a survey like this, that it is to be determined by the test as to whether it is a continuation of a public work, or by the test as to whether it must be something tangible or material. It is sufficient if it may be a mere physical survey or a mere scientific investigation, and at all events it comes within the meaning of the language of Rule XXI so often read:

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress.

There has been in progress here for twenty-five years, or a score of years, at least, this work of the Geological Survey,

which necessarily includes a topographical survey, and it is so designated and described in the bill and as in former law. It is an object within the meaning of the rules, and it is nothing else, and therefore I insist that the point of order is not well taken.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the point of order is not well taken, as has been suggested by the gentleman from Ohio [KEIFER], for the reason that a topographic survey is a necessary preliminary to a geological survey under the practice of the Geological Survey of this country, and there can be no such thing as a geological survey, as specifically referred to in lines 22, 23, and 24, unless there shall have been a topographical survey of the territory to be mapped and surveyed geologically. This appropriation might properly read:

For the preliminary surveys as a foundation for geological surveys.

And I call the attention of the House to the map before us, which clearly indicates that these topographical surveys are made as the foundation of geological surveys. The examination of geological structure, examination of the mineral resources and products of the national domain, provided for in the law, and against which no point of order has been made; the preparation of the geological map of the United States herein provided for, none of these things could be completely accomplished without a topographic survey, which this paragraph provides for, which is the foundation and initial work of the geological survey. I am inclined to think, Mr. Chairman, that the same work could be done if this particular provision were not in the bill, that topographic surveys could possibly be carried out under lines 22, 23, and 24 of the bill, because they are the necessary preliminary of the geological survey.

They fix the boundaries of the territory to be surveyed geologically, they run the contour lines indicating elevations, the structure, and character of the country, and with the information that is thus obtained the Department proceeds to the examination and mapping of the geological structure provided for in the law. Without this necessary preliminary work the geological survey, of which it is a part, and a most important part, can not be carried out and completed.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is made to that section of the pending bill included in lines 19, 20, and 21 on page 75, and reads as follows:

For topographical surveys in various portions of the United States, \$300,000, to be immediately available.

The Chair thinks it is not subject to a point of order, and will give his reasons very briefly. The Chair desires to distinguish between this item and the one last ruled out by the Chair. In the opinion of the Chair there is no law in existence now authorizing the gauging of streams, nor is there any law in existence now authorizing the topographical survey of any portion of the United States. The Chair desires, however, to say that in the act creating the Geological Survey there is no positive inhibition or prohibition as against the language contemplated in the section now under consideration.

Mr. STAFFORD. May I interrupt the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is there anything in the organic act prohibiting the gauging of streams?

The CHAIRMAN. There is nothing in the organic act which prohibits the gauging of streams, and the Chair is about to distinguish between the two cases. There is nothing in the organic act which prohibits either, and either having once been begun by a provision on an appropriation bill would be a work in progress, provided it came within the meaning of "a public work in progress" as set forth by our rule.

Now, any act or any building or any public work can be begun whether there is authorization in law for it or not, provided no point of order is made on the appropriation. And when once begun it may be a public work in progress and may be continued by subsequent appropriations. For instance, the House can put in an appropriation bill a provision to spend \$100,000 to erect a public building without any previous authorization of law, provided no point of order be raised against it; but once having been begun under that act of appropriating, all other appropriations necessary to complete the object would be in order.

Now, the Chair thinks the only difference between this pending proposition and the one last ruled on by the Chair rests in the fact that this is a definite, specific something that can be concluded and completed, while the other was not. The gauging of streams is something that might continue forever; you might gauge the same stream over and over again, and as the water supply decreased or increased the gauging could be carried on. What is meant by topography? The Chair will read:

A detailed description of particular places, especially the art of representing on a map the physical features of any locality.

Now, having once taken the topography of a county or of a State, it remains the same; so that this is a continuing work in progress, in the opinion of the Chair, which distinguishes it clearly from the gauging of streams and the determining of the water supply of the United States, and therefore the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I now offer again my amendment, which was held not to be in order until the point of order had been determined.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 75, line 20, amend by adding after the word "hundred" the word "fifty."

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I want the committee to understand what this amendment is and what it means. There has been a great deal said to Members of this House by the scientific gentlemen in the Bureau of the Geological Survey concerning the action of the Committee on Appropriations in respect to all of these appropriations for the Geological Survey. A great deal has been written by scientific gentlemen all over the country, at whose instance I shall endeavor to show, concerning our action in reducing certain appropriations carried for this service. Briefs have been prepared by the men in the Survey and distributed by members to the Members for use in this debate.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that a statement on behalf of the committee should be made, giving the reasons for our action. I therefore ask the attention of the committee while I state our side of the case.

This is something more than a business proposition. It is a question of whether the Geological Survey shall fix the standard of expenditure in its bureau by determining the amount of its appropriations or whether Congress shall perform that function untrammelled by the influence the officers of the Survey can command by reason of the private, State, and municipal interests they serve.

I want to assure every Member of the House that no personal consideration entered into or influenced the action of the committee, either individually or collectively. I say this because Members of the House have said to me that the Director of the Survey said to them that he thought we were influenced by some prejudice against him personally. The committee, in reducing these few appropriations, were actuated by no other motive than that of serving the best interests of the Government. Take, for example, this appropriation of \$300,000 for topographical surveys. The Director of the Survey has had no more than that amount appropriated for the service during the past four years except the current year.

Prior to that time, namely, in 1902, they had \$250,000; in 1901, \$240,000; in 1900, \$240,000; in 1899, \$180,000, and so on down. The committee, in the last session of the last Congress, reported this identical item at \$300,000. But as the result of the influence which the Geological Survey can and does exert through the private interests that are benefited by its work throughout the United States, the same combination was formed here on this floor that now exists, and the House increased the appropriation to \$350,000. We reported it at \$300,000, because we all know that during the next fiscal year the revenues and the expenses of the Government will run almost equal, with the chances in favor of a deficit. In the desire of the committee to keep down the appropriations as much as possible, and in the hope of preventing a deficit, we felt justified in reporting the appropriations for topographical surveys at \$300,000. It has never been more, except for the current year. In doing this we believed the service would not be impaired in the least. It might retard to some extent the making of a few topographical surveys in some of the States, but there would be no harm done and no injury to the public service, and for that reason, Mr. Chairman, we felt this reduction ought to be made in the interests of economy.

The next appropriation complained of is the appropriation for the report on the mineral resources, collecting statistics of the mineral resources of the United States. In the brief which has been prepared by the Geological Survey and presented to certain Members of the House for the purpose of influencing the action of the House in respect to these appropriations it is said that we have cut that appropriation in two; that we have given them \$50,000 instead of \$100,000, which they say they have this year. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that that is absolutely false, and the man who wrote it knows it is false. We gave them this year just what they had in the past and all they have heretofore asked for for this purpose. They obtained \$25,000 from the last Congress for the purpose of investigating black sands, which was a new investigation, and at the beginning of this Congress they came to us and said

there was a deficit and that it would require \$25,000 more to complete that investigation. They had previously represented that if this work could be done at Portland, Oreg., at the exposition, it could be done very much cheaper, and that they had so many tons of samples to analyze and investigate, and that \$25,000 would complete the work. That was entirely outside and independent of the collection of statistics of mineral production heretofore carried on by the Department; and in view of the fact that that work will be completed this summer we reported in favor of an appropriation of \$50,000—the same amount they have had the last four years for this service.

Mr. BONYNGE. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes.

Mr. BONYNGE. Mr. Chairman, last year was not \$75,000 appropriated for the preparation of the mineral resources, and \$25,000 in the urgent deficiency bill of this year, making in all \$100,000?

Mr. TAWNEY. No, sir; \$50,000 was appropriated last year for collection of statistics relating to mineral production, and \$25,000 was appropriated for the black sand investigation, and at this session of Congress we appropriated \$25,000 more to complete the investigation of black sands, so that we have reported in this bill all they have ever had heretofore for this purpose, and there has been no reduction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to continue my remarks for ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to proceed for ten minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to conclude his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota may be permitted to conclude his remarks. Is there objection?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I object unless there is some limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana objects. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that he may be permitted to proceed for ten minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONYNGE. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from Minnesota whether it is not a fact that in the appropriation bill of last year there was one item for the preparation of the mineral resources, which included the examination of the black sands—\$75,000—and that there was no apportionment of that \$75,000 as between the preparation of the mineral resources and the examination of the black sands.

Mr. TAWNEY. It was carried in the same item with a distinct understanding that \$25,000 was to be devoted to the investigation of black sands, and that amount was apportioned for that purpose and was exhausted in that investigation, and at the beginning of this Congress we gave them \$25,000 additional for the purpose of completing that work, so that in fact they received \$50,000 last year for this work. This is the amount they have had for a number of years prior to this year, and they are to have \$50,000 during the next fiscal year.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. The committee was so kind as to allow me to speak the other day on this measure, and I do not want to speak again, and therefore I simply want to ask the gentleman this question and desire that his time be extended: As he has succeeded in knocking out on a point of order the expense of gauging streams, does the gentleman think it would interfere with his plan of economy as presented in the bill to let us have now this increase for topographical survey?

Mr. TAWNEY. These items should be considered on their merits.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the appropriation for the preparation of this work for a number of years past has been \$50,000 a year.

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. The committee, I have no doubt, took into consideration the fact that the country is growing, that new mineral fields are being opened all the time, and that a wider range of inquiry is necessary year after year. And taking into consideration that growth and development of the country, does not the gentleman believe that a slightly increased proportion is necessary to take care of the ordinary growth and development of the mineral industries of the country?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Will the Chairman allow me to suggest, in reply to the question, that the country is not growing

any larger than it was and as this work is being done the amount to be surveyed is growing smaller every year instead of larger.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, my statement, I think, was not that the country was growing larger, although it has expanded somewhat in the past few years, but the discovery of minerals has vastly expanded. If the gentleman will recall—

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I did not yield for a speech.

Mr. MONDELL. Excuse me.

Mr. TAWNEY. The gentleman evidently does not know the details of this service. If he would study the hearings he would see that this matter was carefully considered by the committee. The committee insisted upon a full, detailed statement as to what was to be done with this \$50,000; we find that there are certain gentlemen who are sent out through the country to gather these statistics. This is the first source from which they obtain information regarding mineral statistics. Then they have a system of communication. They have mailing lists or persons to whom they send blanks to fill out, and in this way they collect the information regarding the mineral products of the country. It does not involve the investigation into the mineral resources, it simply involves the collection of information regarding the mineral products for the fiscal year. To a certain extent this work has been duplicated. The Bureau of the Mint, in the Treasury Department, is engaged in doing the same work with respect to precious metals, and we discovered by comparing the statistics furnished by the Mint and the statistics collected by the Geological Survey in respect to the production of gold and silver, that there was a difference of over a million or a million and a half, as I now recall it, in nine States between the statistics furnished by these two bureaus. We also discovered that this work was being duplicated. We got Professor, or Doctor Day, as he is called, and the Director of the Mint together—

Mr. WILEY of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAWNEY. No; I must decline to yield just now. We got them together. They have agreed on a plan for collecting these statistics that will cost the Government less than has heretofore been expended, so the Geological Survey will, with this appropriation, have even more money to expend this year than it has had during the current year with the same amount.

Mr. Chairman, there is only one other appropriation of any consequence that we reduce, and that is the appropriation for the survey of forest reserves. The reduction is \$30,000. That appropriation has also increased very rapidly. This service, Mr. Chairman, it will be conceded is not so very important. Even if this reduction of \$30,000 does cause a little delay nobody will suffer in consequence of it. It is a service that will continue for many years, but a service that does not directly affect the people, and if retarded a little will do no harm.

Mr. Chairman, if it were not for the active, energetic work of the Geological Survey in creating sentiment throughout the country in favor of its appropriation, there is hardly a man on the floor of this House who would not accept the recommendations of the committee. This sentiment could not be created but for the manner in which most of these appropriations are distributed.

There is no man employed by the Federal Government who has as many favors to distribute throughout this House as the Director of the Geological Survey. These favors are not given to individual Members, but to their States and their home cities, and therein is the secret of his power. What is he doing with these Federal appropriations? He goes to your State, he goes to my State, and so says: "Unless these appropriations can be increased on the floor of the House or in the Senate of the United States, then we can not do this work for you next year."

This method of lobbying has been carried in this instance to an extent far beyond anything ever before attempted. I want to call attention to it briefly. It shows a system whereby appropriations can be increased that has no equal in our Government. I hold in my hand a letter that I received through the mail, which was written by Mr. Holmes, who is an officer, one of the scientific gentlemen employed by the Geological Survey. It was written in respect to structural material. He sent this letter out—a circular letter, as he stated to the committee—to a large number of engineers throughout the United States. He says:

I am sending you herewith a copy of his report—

Report of the structural material—

In response to this resolution, in which he recommends the continuance of these investigations, giving reasons therefor, and asks Congress to make an appropriation of \$350,000 for this work during the next fiscal year. The final report on the fuel investigations during 1904 is now ready for distribution (Professional Paper No. 48), and you can obtain free of charge a copy of this report by applying for it at once to some Member of Congress or to the Director of the Geological

Survey. If in writing for this report you feel sufficient interest in this work to express an opinion as to its continuance, I am sure that such an expression of opinion on your part will be considered appropriate.

This is only a part of the letter. I will print it in full with my remarks.

When this gentleman was before the committee he was interrogated concerning his right to thus attempt to influence the action of the committee and create a back fire on Congress for the purpose of securing appropriations in the expenditure of which he is directly interested. In one question that I asked him I quoted this language, and said that I would print the letter in connection with his testimony. Subsequently the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], a member of the Committee on Appropriations, asked him a question in which he also quoted that paragraph. On last Sunday I was looking over this testimony to refresh my recollection, and I found this letter as it was printed on page 614 of the hearings. Any gentleman can turn to that page and he will find the letter, but he will not find that paragraph. Knowing that it was there in the original, as shown from my question, I read from page 613:

You say if in writing for this report you are sufficiently interested in the work to express an opinion as to its continuance, I am sure such an expression on your part will be considered appropriate—

And so forth.

And that also because on the next page, where Mr. Smith asked him the same question, I concluded that some one had tampered with the letter. On the following morning I sent for the original testimony of this gentleman, and found the stenographer sent the letter, with the transcript of that gentleman's testimony, to him personally. When it was sent to him it was not changed in any way. When it came back this paragraph was underscored—that is, the lines I have read were underscored—and on the margin was written, "Leave out these lines" as a direction to the printer. This was done by the man who corrected Mr. Holmes's testimony, and that man was presumably Mr. Holmes, who wrote the letter originally, who was criticised by the committee. He evidently was conscious of having gone a little too far in his attempt to increase the appropriation, and no doubt thought that some criticism might be urged against him on the floor if some Member saw the letter. He therefore deliberately emasculates the letter, which was not his. It was a public document, concerning which he was interrogated, and after that interrogation he deliberately went to work and emasculated the letter by striking out that portion of it which the committee criticised him for writing.

Mr. REEDER. Who wrote the letter?

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Holmes.

The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] having expired, by unanimous consent he was granted leave to continue his remarks.

Mr. TAWNEY. The name of the gentleman is J. A. Holmes, and when he was before the committee I handed him the letter and asked him if the signature was his. He said it was; and he also testified, as you will see, that he had sent out a number of them to engineers—to the members of a board of engineers, of which I want to speak later.

Mr. DALZELL. Will the gentleman allow me a moment? To whom was this letter addressed?

Mr. TAWNEY. It is not addressed to anyone. It is a circular letter, and you will find that Mr. Holmes admits it was a circular letter and addressed generally to the engineers.

Mr. DALZELL. Did he not say it was sent out in answer to several hundred letters that he had received from various parts of the country, from engineers and architects, and so on, who were seeking information on this subject and who had addressed him concerning it?

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes; I think he made that statement, and in order to show the insincerity, if not the untruthfulness of that statement, I will read the first paragraph of this letter:

The United States Senate recently passed a resolution asking the Secretary of the Interior for an expression of opinion concerning the continuance of the investigation of fuels and structural materials by the United States Geological Survey.

He does not say in this letter that it was in answer to an inquiry. That was an afterthought. It was like another letter that I have here.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. TAWNEY. Just a moment. The day this letter was presented to him he was also confronted with another letter which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] kindly referred to me as the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. This letter was written by Mr. Swenson, in Mr. DALZELL's district, in which Mr. Swenson says:

Supplementing my letter to you of February 14, 1906, relative to an item of \$100,000 in the sundry civil bill for the work of testing

structural materials at the laboratory, World's Fair grounds, St. Louis, under the direction of the United States Geological Survey. I am advised this morning by the gentleman in charge of the laboratory as follows:

"I find—

That is, the gentleman in charge of the laboratory, Mr. Holmes, says:

"I find that there is some doubt in the minds of the subcommittee of the sundry civil bill as to whether or not the Government should carry on tests of concrete and reinforced concrete."

He no doubt made that discovery from the questions that were asked him, and immediately he draws on the men with whom he is acquainted, or the engineers throughout the United States, for the purpose of getting their assistance in securing appropriations for the Geological Survey regardless of the judgment of the committee. Then this gentleman goes on and says:

Knowing my impersonal interest in getting at the truth of this important subject, and my desire to see this matter, which is now spreading over the country like wildfire, put on proper scientific basis, he—

The man in charge of the laboratory, Mr. Holmes—

he goes on to ask me to assist in the matter, even to going before the subcommittee and explaining its importance to the country at large. I regret very much that previous important engagements prevent me from lending my assistance by going to Washington in person, and will have to content myself with falling back on our energetic Representative in Congress. Pardon me for again bothering you—

And so forth.

Mr. Chairman, the Geological Survey is the most ambitious branch of the public service we have. The present Director of the Geological Survey had only about \$400,000 appropriated for that service when he was appointed Director in 1894. Today he has over a million. Therefore his appropriations have increased in that time more than 300 per cent. This is the first time in his administration it has ever been proposed to reduce the aggregate of his appropriation. There has been a steady increase. Every reduction now proposed is recommended in the belief that the public interest demanded it, and that there would be no injury or harm in consequence of such reduction.

Mr. Chairman, I spoke a moment ago about the way in which the influence of the Survey has been exerted to increase these appropriations. I have here a telegram which I received from the general solicitor of the Burlington Railway Company. In order to secure the influence of that railway company it was deemed necessary to show that the appropriation for the gauging of streams would in some way affect the Reclamation Service, although in the brief presented to Members of the House by the Geological Survey it is expressly stated that this appropriation does not in any way involve the Reclamation Service. But it was deemed necessary, in order to secure the influence of that great railroad that traverses the reclamation section of our country, to convey the idea to some one that this Reclamation Service was suffering in consequence of this reduction. I have here a telegram from the general solicitor of that road, Mr. Dawes. It is a carbon copy, I suppose, of many received by Members of Congress.

CHICAGO, ILL., June 2, 1906.

HON. JAMES A. TAWNEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

I am advised that it is proposed to cut down the appropriation for gauging streams and investigating water supply under the reclamation act from \$200,000 to \$100,000. Such a reduction would greatly hamper the development of the West in this direction and cut off work where it is proceeding rapidly and advantageously. Hope you will consider it consistent with the public interest to use your influence to see that the appropriation is maintained at \$200,000.

CHESTER M. DAWES,
General Solicitor Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railway.

To which message I replied as follows:

JUNE 2, 1906.

CHESTER M. DAWES,
General Solicitor C., B. and Q. R. R., Chicago, Ill.:

Wire received. Please advise me in what respect will the development of the West be hampered by the failure to gauge streams in New England, the South, and other States east of the Mississippi River. It is conceded that this work is being done in the interest of prospective investors in water powers. Under what provision of the Constitution can Congress justify the appropriation of public money for the benefit of prospective or actual investors in private enterprise? I sincerely regret I can not consider it consistent with the public interest or with my duty to the people to continue appropriations for gauging of streams in States where the Government does not own a foot of land and where the streams are admitted to be nonnavigable. Reclamation Service is not involved.

JAS. A. TAWNEY.

To which I received the following reply:

CHICAGO, ILL., June 4, 1906.

HON. J. A. TAWNEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

I was under misapprehension of the situation when I sent my dispatch to you. I thank you very much for your explanation of the matter.

CHESTER M. DAWES.

Later I received the following letter:

CHICAGO, BURLINGTON AND QUINCY RAILWAY COMPANY,
Chicago, June 8, 1906.

HON. JAMES A. TAWNEY,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. TAWNEY: I am in receipt of yours of 6th instant, explaining the situation with reference to the reduction of the appropriation for gauging streams, etc.

I regret very much to have put you to all this trouble through ignorance of the facts. The matter was brought to me, as I stated, by our traffic people, but who set them onto it I do not know. I naturally took their information as accurate and wired you as I did.

I desire to say that I am in full accord with the position you have assumed in the matter. I do not see what else you could do consistently with your public duty.

I am, with great respect, yours, very truly,

CHESTER A. DAWES, General Solicitor.

But, Mr. Chairman, this is not all; knowing that Members were receiving numerous telegrams and letters on the subject of these particular appropriations, I sent to the Secretary of the Interior a dispatch, asking him to send me copies of all letters, telegrams, or other communications sent out by the Geological Survey concerning this appropriation, and I received in reply this letter, which I will not stop to read, with a letter inclosed from the Director of the Geological Survey, both of which I will here insert:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, June 8, 1906.

HON. JAMES A. TAWNEY,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Your telegram has been received, requesting to be advised whether any officers or employees of your Department, particularly of the Geological Survey, have written or sent to any person or persons, outside of Washington, letters, circulars, or otherwise, or telegrams on the subject of appropriations estimated for under the Geological Survey, and if such letters have been sent, please cause copies thereof to be furnished to the committee as soon as practicable."

In response thereto, I have the honor to transmit herewith copy of a letter from the Director of the Geological Survey, to whose attention your wishes in the matter were called, submitting a report in the premises, with copies of two letters written by an employee of the Survey in relation to the increasing of certain Survey appropriations.

Due inquiry fails to show that any officers or employees of this Department, outside of the Geological Survey, have sent any person or persons outside of Washington letters, circulars, or otherwise, or telegrams on the subject of appropriations for the work of the Geological Survey.

Very respectfully,

E. A. HITCHCOCK, Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY,
Washington, D. C., June 6, 1906.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I am in receipt of a copy of a telegram sent to you on June 5, by the Hon. JAMES A. TAWNEY, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, asking that he be advised whether any of the officers or employees of the Department of the Interior, and particularly of the Geological Survey, had written or sent to any person or persons outside of Washington letters, circulars, or otherwise, or telegrams on the subject of the appropriation estimated for under the Geological Survey and asking that if such letters or telegrams have been sent, copies thereof be furnished to the committee as soon as practicable.

I beg to report in this connection that the Director of the Geological Survey has neither written nor sent, nor caused to be written or sent, any such letters, circulars, or telegrams; nor has he been able to learn of any such letters, circulars, or telegrams having been sent by the officers or employees of the Survey, except the two letters copies of which are attached hereto. I may add that a typewritten statement concerning the investigation of fuels and structural materials was sent out on request to the members of the National Advisory Board on Fuels and Structural Materials, about May 20; but it neither contained nor was accompanied by any suggestion of action on their part relative to the appropriation for these subjects.

Yours, truly,

CHAS. D. WALCOTT, Director.

JUNE 4, 1906.

DR. C. W. HALL,
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR SIR: In reply to yours of May 28:

We had hoped to be able to continue our topographic surveys in Minnesota this year, but the Committee on Appropriations, of which Mr. TAWNEY, of Minnesota, is chairman, has reported our appropriation bill with great reductions from previous bills. On the item for topography he cut \$50,000. The necessary result is that unless this item is restored on the floor of the House or in the Senate we must reduce the amount of work which we are to do, and this will doubtless prevent the extension of work into new areas.

If you are especially interested in this work, I suggest that you immediately bring it to the attention of your Senators.

Very truly, yours,

H. M. WILSON, Geographer.

JUNE 4, 1906.

HON. JOHN LIND,
Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR SIR: At the request of Hon. LOREN FLETCHER, there is mailed you to-day a preliminary photolithographic copy of Lake Minnetonka map.

We have just received a request from C. W. Hall, of the University of Minnesota, to extend these surveys into the remainder of Hennepin County, and I have advised him that we had hoped to do so, but that the Committee on Appropriations, the chairman of which is from your State, has reported our appropriation bill with a cut of \$50,000 in the item for topographic surveying. Necessarily unless this item is re-

stored on the floor when the bill comes up, about the 7th or 8th, or unless it is restored in the Senate we will not be able to extend our topographic work into new areas, and the survey of this region would therefore doubtless have to be deferred until some future date.

Very truly, yours,

H. M. WILSON, *Geographer.*

Is it not strange, Mr. Chairman, that the only two letters sent out by the Survey concerning these appropriations were sent to Minnesota? This may be a coincidence; if it is, certainly it is a remarkable one. These letters were written to people in my own State, and, the Director says, were the only people addressed on this subject. It may be true, but in view of all the letters and telegrams received by Members it is difficult for anyone to believe it. The first is to Prof. C. W. Hall, of the University of Minnesota—

In reply to yours of the 28th—

Now, I want to say that they started to make a topographical survey of Hennepin County. That is Minneapolis. If any man can tell me or show me wherein we are justified in appropriating public money for the purpose of making a topographical survey for the benefit of street-railway companies and water-power companies, and for the benefit of the municipalities, then I admit that this appropriation ought to be increased twofold, because the Geological Survey could do nothing else but make topographical surveys for the cities of the Union and for the benefit of these private interests during the next fiscal year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TAWNEY. I desire to read these two letters.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may continue his remarks for ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the gentleman from Minnesota may continue his remarks for ten minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAWNEY. This letter I will read first is addressed to Dr. C. W. Hall, of the University of Minnesota, and is in reply to a letter addressed to the Bureau. It is signed by H. M. Wilson, geographer of the Geological Survey:

We had hoped to be able to continue our topographic surveys in Minnesota this year, but the Committee on Appropriations, of which Mr. TAWNEY, of Minnesota, is chairman, has reported our appropriation bill with great reductions from previous bills. On the item for topography he cut \$50,000—

Which is the amount the Committee on Appropriations reported to the last Congress, and which his department estimated and had estimated for three years prior—

The necessary result is that unless this item is restored on the floor of the House—

How suggestive!

or in the Senate, we must reduce the amount of work which we are able to do, and this will doubtless prevent the extension of work into new areas.

If you are especially interested in this work, I suggest that you immediately bring it to the attention of your Senators.

That letter is signed by Mr. Wilson.

Mr. WILEY of New Jersey. Was not that letter written in answer to one from Doctor Hall?

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes; I so stated.

Mr. WILEY of New Jersey. You omitted the first line.

Mr. TAWNEY (reading):

In reply to yours of May 28—

I stated that it was a reply.

Mr. WILEY of New Jersey. That line was not read by the gentleman before.

Mr. TAWNEY. Now, another letter, which is not "in reply," written to Hon. John Lind, of Minneapolis, who is the man who initiated the movement here in the last Congress to increase this appropriation \$50,000:

HON. JOHN LIND,
Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR SIR: At the request of Hon. Loren Fletcher, there is mailed you to-day a preliminary photolithographic copy of Lake Minnetonka map.

It does not say that Mr. Fletcher requested him to write in regard to his appropriations.

We have just received a request from C. W. Hall, of the University of Minnesota, to extend these surveys into the remainder of Hennepin County, and I have advised him that we had hoped to do so, but that the Committee on Appropriations, the chairman of which is from your State, has reported our appropriation bill with a cut of \$50,000 in the item for topographic surveys. Necessarily, unless this item is restored on the floor when the bill comes up, about the 7th or 8th, or unless it is restored in the Senate—

He was very particular to put in the exact date when this bill was to be considered—

we will not be able to extend our topographic work into new areas, and the survey of this region would therefore doubtless have to be deferred until some future date.

When I received the letter from Mr. Walcott saying a type-

written statement had been sent out, I sent another telegram to the Secretary of the Interior for a copy of this typewritten statement sent to the board of engineers, and also a request to know who had appointed this board of engineers, by what authority of law they were appointed, and what salary or compensation they were receiving, although the testimony of Mr. Holmes says that they are to receive \$5 per day when they actually serve. The Secretary, in answering the communication, sends me another letter from the Director of the Geological Survey, all of which I will not take the time to read:

Replying to the same—

Referring to my telegram—

I beg to report that this board was appointed by the President; and I respectfully suggest that this request for information concerning it should be addressed to the President.

The typewritten statement referred to as having been sent to the members of that board, I am informed, was prepared and sent out to them by the acting secretary of the board. I have neither personal nor official information concerning it, except that when Mr. TAWNEY'S previous request was received my general inquiry brought out the fact that such a circular statement had been sent out from the Survey building to the members of this board. And notwithstanding the fact that this action was unofficial, and was explained as having no real or intended relation to the committee's estimate, yet I thought it best to mention it in my former reply to Mr. TAWNEY'S inquiry.

I have been unable to secure an exact copy of the statement sent out, but will endeavor to do so and forward it to you later in the day if possible.

Now, I want to call your attention, gentlemen, to this national advisory board of engineers, which has been created as an adjunct to the Geological Survey, to assist in carrying on their scientific investigations respecting tests of building material and fuel or coal tests. This board was appointed without authority of law. They number thirty-nine in all. I have the names of all of them here and the positions they occupy and the States in which they reside. The list is as follows:

List of members national advisory board on fuels and structural materials.

From the American Institute of Mining Engineers: Robert W. Hunt, president, Chicago, Ill.; John Hays Hammond, past president, Empire Building, New York; B. F. Bush, member, St. Louis, Mo.

From the American Institute of Electrical Engineers: Francis B. Crocker, Columbia University, New York; Henry G. Stott, New York.

From the American Society of Civil Engineers: C. C. Schneider, ex-president, chairman committee on concrete and reinforced concrete, Philadelphia, Pa.; George S. Webster, chairman committee on cement specifications, Philadelphia, Pa.

From the American Society of Mechanical Engineers: W. F. M. Goss, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.; George H. Barrus, Boston, Mass.; P. W. Gates, Chicago, Ill.

From the American Society for Testing Materials: Charles B. Dudley, president, Altoona, Pa.; Robert W. Lesley, vice-president, Philadelphia, Pa.

From the American Institute of Architects: George B. Post, past president, New York; William S. Eames, past president, St. Louis, Mo.

From the American Railway Engineering and Maintenance of Way Association: H. C. Kelley, president, Minneapolis, Minn.; Julius Kruttschnitt, Chicago, Ill.; Hunter McDonald, past president, Nashville, Tenn.

From the American Railway Master Mechanics' Association: J. F. Deems, New York; A. W. Gibbs, Altoona, Pa.

From the American Foundrymen's Association: Richard Moldenke, secretary, Watchung, N. J.

From the Association of American Portland Cement Manufacturers: John B. Lober, president, Philadelphia, Pa.

From the Geological Society of America: Samuel Calvin, professor of geology, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa; I. C. White, State geologist, Morgantown, W. Va.

From the Iron and Steel Institute: Julian Kennedy, Pittsburg, Pa.; C. S. Robinson, Denver, Colo.

From the National Association of Cement Users: Richard L. Humphrey, president, St. Louis, Mo.

From the National Board of Fire Underwriters: Chas. A. Hexamer, chairman board of consulting experts, Philadelphia, Pa.

From the National Brick Manufacturers' Association: John W. Sibley, Birmingham, Ala.; William D. Gates, Chicago, Ill.

From the National Fire Protection Association: E. U. Crosby, chairman executive committee, Philadelphia, Pa.

From the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association: Nelson W. McLeod, president, St. Louis, Mo.; John L. Kaul, vice-president, Birmingham, Ala.

From the Corps of Engineers, United States Army: Lieut. Col. William L. Marshall, Army Building, New York.

From the Isthmian Canal Commission: Lieut. Col. O. H. Ernst, Washington, D. C.

From the Bureau of Yards and Docks, United States Navy: Civil Engineer Frank T. Chambers, Washington, D. C.

From the Supervising Architect's Office, United States Treasury Department: James K. Taylor, Supervising Architect, Washington, D. C.

From the Reclamation Service, United States Interior Department: F. H. Newell, chief engineer, Washington, D. C.

From Bureau of Steam Engineering, United States Navy: Rear-Admiral Charles W. Rae, chief, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Chairman, here is a Bureau which has increased its appropriations more than 300 per cent in twelve years, a Bureau that is constantly reaching out for new fields of investigation, a Bureau that is constantly branching out, and has added to it an organization consisting of thirty-nine distinguished and eminent engineers throughout this country, who are to receive a compensation when they are actually engaged in service of \$5 a day.

A bureau or board appointed without authority of law.

When are we going to call a halt in the ambition of this Bureau, this man, the Director of the Survey, for whom I entertain the highest respect? The Director of the Geological Survey is unquestionably the ablest man that has occupied the position, one of the best administrative officers in the Government, but when he seeks to use the influence he acquires by virtue of the administration of his department for the purpose of increasing his appropriation I say it is time for this House to call a halt. [Applause.] While he is an eminent scientist, a good administrative officer, these are not his only accomplishments. He is also the smoothest and most scientific and accomplished lobbyist connected with the Government.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from Minnesota one question. The gentleman is a distinguished Member of this House, has been here a great many years, and I have great respect and regard for him. I want to ask him if all the various researches conducted by the Geological Survey under the leadership of Charles O. Walcott, Director—the gentleman for whom he says he entertains such high regard—I want to ask him if the gauging of streams, the investigation of the mineral resources of the country, and the topographical surveys do not all tend to the development of the United States, do they not all tend to develop the resources of the country?

Mr. TAWNEY. I will answer the gentleman in his own time. What right have we as the representatives of the people to appropriate the people's money for the purpose of developing water powers in the interest of prospective investors? [Applause.] There is no governmental function involved in the doing of that work. The duty of the Government is to govern. It is the duty of the people to develop the country, but not at the expense of the Government. The topographic surveys should be made by the States not by the General Government, and the streams should be gauged by the corporations that desire the water powers at their expense. It is not the business of the Government to gauge them to enable these private corporations to determine whether it will or will not pay to invest their capital in them.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. I am not talking about water powers in the interest of investors. I am talking about the development of the resources of the country by the work of the Geological Survey as a whole, which I believe has benefited the whole country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, it has been my fortune to serve on this committee under three different chairmen. Naturally we study our chairman and his methods, and it is no disparagement to either of the other eminent gentlemen who have filled this responsible position since I have been a member of the committee to say that neither one has been more thorough, more nonpartisan, more patriotic in conserving the interests of the Government than the present chairman. [Applause.] Two years ago I served on the subcommittee having the sundry civil bill in charge, and we met precisely the same thing we are meeting to-day. Somebody had been plowing with our helper. [Laughter.] Somebody had been using influence secretly. We knew it, but could not trace it every time. Somebody was undermining the foundation upon which the committee stood in making this report. Somebody was clandestinely working to undo what the committee had done. The same work has been done now, but it has been traced. It has its headquarters in this city. It is going out to the various parts of the country and coming back here as though the initiative was elsewhere.

I have been on several subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee, and in no other instance, so far as my experience goes, have we run across any bureau chief who seeks as does this one to dominate the committee and therefore dominate the House. Here is a subordinate undertaking to run the committee and through it the Congress. I tell you, gentlemen, when you lose your confidence in the fidelity, the wisdom, and the patriotism of the Appropriations Committee you had better dismiss the committee, and until you do it is not safe to follow the ambitions of a man the appropriations for whose bureau have risen from \$400,000 to more than \$1,000,000 in a little while, and still he is asking for more. If he can not get in regularly by the front door, then he tries some other way. I appeal to this House to stand by the committee because it is right, and to rebuke this betrayal of trust to gain an end which, however worthy some may think it to be, ought not to be gained by such means as he employs. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I decline to determine the wisdom of increasing an appropriation from \$300,000 to \$350,000, either upon the excellence of the chairman of the Com-

mittee on Appropriations, the general fidelity of the committee itself, or the wrongdoing of some employee of the Geological Survey. The question before this committee is whether \$300,000 will do the work that ought to be done in making topographic maps for the country. If it is wrong to expend \$350,000 in making topographic maps because it helps the street railways, and because it helps some particular individual or set of individuals, it is equally wrong to spend \$300,000 for that purpose. If you are going to determine the constitutional validity of your appropriation, determine it not by the size of the appropriation, by the amount of money you spend, but on principle. It does not become right because you spend one sum, and wrong because you spend another sum; neither does it become right because the money is expended in making a topographical map of the country, and become wrong because it is expended in making a topographical map of a city. The people of the cities are as much entitled to have a geographical map made as the people in the country. The act creating this bill provided for a geographical map of the entire country.

Mr. TAWNEY. I beg to differ with the gentleman. The act does not give authority for that at all.

Mr. SHERLEY. The act does provide for the making of a geographical map of the national domain. Now, if the gentleman wants to put all the cities of America out of the national domain, that is his privilege.

Mr. TAWNEY. This is not for a geological survey. I will ask the gentleman this: On what theory does he justify the expenditure of public money for the making of topographical maps of the city of Louisville?

Mr. SHERLEY. On this theory—

Mr. TAWNEY. On the theory that he can get it?

Mr. SHERLEY. No. I do not necessarily justify it that way, for if I did I would have less justification than the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY], because I have less ability to get from the Administration things for my district than the gentleman has. I justify it for this reason—

Mr. TAWNEY. In the comparison I think the gentleman from Kentucky would be ahead.

Mr. SHERLEY. I hope so. The gentleman is doing me honor overmuch. When I get to be chairman of the Committee on Appropriations I hope to be able to do just as much with my Administration as the gentleman does with his.

Mr. TAWNEY. I hope the gentleman may do more. [Laughter.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, perhaps that is a wish that I can second also. [Renewed laughter.] I certainly do not hope to do less. But that is neither here nor there. I justify these appropriations upon the same ground that I justify the National Government doing many things. The National Government undertakes to do certain things that do not fall within the domain of the States, and whatever may have been said of the original proposition as to whether the National Government had a right to go into internal improvements, a proposition that was fought up and down in the halls of Congress by the ablest men that ever came here, the question has been settled once and for all. We are doing it. The National Government is going into internal improvement, and whatever theory I might have had as an original proposition must fall in face of the actual, concrete facts. The question that confronts the House and the committee is whether you want this work to progress at a certain rate of speed or whether you want it to progress at another rate of speed. The very gentlemen of the committee would not, if they could, prevent the geological work being done or the topographical maps being made. They are simply fighting on the ground of economy. If that be so, if that be the truth, then why not come on this floor and make your fight on that ground?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERLEY. And not undertake to divert the thing by making an attack on the head of a Bureau and a Department. It may be that there has been lobbying for this item, but the difference between the lobbying of this Bureau and the lobbying of a great many other bureaus of the Government has been that it has been a lobbying back to the people themselves to get their opinion, whereas most of the lobbying from the bureaus has been for the benefit of individual and special interests for the expenditure of money because it helps some particular industry. Is this House going to determine what it will do simply because somebody has been guilty of wrongdoing? If the President of the United States has done something wrong, contrary to law,

as the gentleman says, by making appointments of men to this board of engineers, let the House take such action as it seems proper as against the President of the United States, but do not let us pass upon the validity of an appropriation or its size for any such reason as that. That is neither logical nor is it common sense. What I would like is for some member of the committee to rise and tell us on what theory its reductions have been made of appropriations asked, whether they have simply sliced horizontally without regard to things or whether they have actually looked into it. If they did that, we perhaps might have more opinion of their ability than we have from their own estimates of it.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman has examined the hearings he will find that our investigation of the appropriation asked for by the Geological Survey takes up almost a third of the entire testimony in that investigation.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am not speaking of volume so much as I am of quality. Now, let the gentleman tell us why he cuts this appropriation \$50,000.

Mr. TAWNEY. If the gentleman has not read it, then I maintain he can not pass judgment as to its quality.

Mr. SHERLEY. I ask the gentleman why he has made the reduction of \$50,000?

Mr. TAWNEY. I told the gentleman, if he was listening to my statement, the reduction of \$50,000 was made because that leaves the amount at \$300,000, just the amount they have always had, except this year—not always, for they have only had that amount for the last three years—and we felt that under the testimony, inasmuch as a large amount of this money was to be expended in making topographical surveys of cities for the benefit of street railway companies and water powers and for the benefit of municipalities in determining the grade of streets, that they could get along this next fiscal year with \$300,000, especially in view of the fact that the expenses and the revenues of the Government would be very close.

Mr. SHERLEY. If I understand the gentleman, his proposition is based on three things—general economy, the fact that the year before the committee recommended \$300,000, and the fact that certain moneys are being expended for topographical maps in cities. I want to ask the gentleman if he knows what proportion of the money in regard to topographical surveys was being expended in cities and what proportion outside of cities?

Mr. TAWNEY. When the Director was before the committee he was asked that very question with respect to the distribution of this—he has said he had no intimation that there was going to be any reduction in his appropriation—but he was asked to state how much the amount could be reduced if we eliminated the topographic survey of cities, and he could not give us a definite answer, but gave us in a general way what it would cost to make a topographical map of Boston, what it would cost to make a topographical map of Louisville and several other cities—one they are making now in Cincinnati—but we could get no definite answer from him as to how much of this would be expended for topographical surveys in cities.

Mr. SHERLEY. Where did the gentleman get his definite information to determine how much reduction to make because of topographical maps in the cities?

Mr. TAWNEY. We inferred that if he carried out the plan for topographical survey of cities, it would cost at least \$50,000 to do that the next fiscal year, and on that theory we lopped it off.

Mr. SHERLEY. Does the gentleman know it would cost \$50,000 to make topographical maps in cities, and is he willing to state to the House as the ground for this reduction the doing of this work in cities?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. If the chairman will permit me, does the gentleman mean to say if the Director of the Geological Survey was so ignorant of his own office before this committee that he could not state what it would cost to make topographical maps of the cities that his estimates ought absolutely to be taken by Congress, and the committee is in error in not being bound by his judgment?

Mr. SHERLEY. It does not prove anything of the kind, but it at least brings the matter up for this House to consider and not to be told by a member of the committee if we dare to differ with the committee's estimate on an appropriation it is high time to abolish the committee. Now, with all deference—and I have as much respect for the committee as—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. SHERLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, and then I will yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I want to say to the gentleman from Kentucky my information is that the Geological Survey does not make topographical maps of cities, but simply adapt to the general work of the Survey maps of the cities made in their—

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to correct that statement, because the Director of the Geological Survey, if the gentleman will read his testimony, gave us a list of cities which they have topographically surveyed.

Mr. SHERLEY. I want to be absolutely frank in that. There is now being made a topographical map of the city of Louisville. It is being made there, and all the cost resulting from making it vary in the slightest from any other topographical map is being borne by the city of Louisville. And I want to say further that it costs less, foot for foot, square for square, mile for mile, to make a topographical map of a city than it does to make a topographical map of the country; and it is a new creed, a new doctrine, that a man who lives in a city should not have the benefit of Government work, but the man who lives in the country may have it. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan for a question—not all of my time.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. The gentleman reaches a criticism of the committee just at that particular point. I will say it will lie against every other appropriation recommended by a committee with equal force. You must rely upon the judgment of the committee or your appropriations will increase three and four and maybe five fold. Who is to be the judge with all the information presented?

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman's argument is valid, the logic of it is we had better take a bill as reported by the committee and pass it without any discussion at all. The proposition defeats itself. If the committee is infallible, what is the good of wasting the time of Congress in discussing any item in the bill? An amendment may relate to a reduction as well as a raise. The trouble is the gentleman is supersensitive because men happen to differ with the committee's wisdom. Because they want to raise an appropriation is no reflection upon the committee. We accord you proper industry, proper intelligence, but we deny you absolute infinite wisdom. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. TAWNEY. I want to ask the gentleman this question: You are criticising or endeavoring to ascertain on what basis the committee made this recommendation. I want to say in addition to the reasons I gave a moment ago that the head of the Department, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Director of the Geological Survey, in presenting their estimates for the present fiscal year at the last session of Congress, estimated only \$300,000 for this service, but as a result of the Director going over the head of his superior and coming into Congress and making the combination that we have been up against today he was able to secure an increase of \$50,000. Now, I want to ask the gentleman this: Do you consider, not having read the hearings at all—

Mr. SHERLEY. I never said that, and I now say to the gentleman that I have read them. I simply said that I was not judging the hearings by their size, as the gentleman was.

Mr. TAWNEY. I understood the gentleman to say a moment ago that he had not read them.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman misunderstood me.

Mr. TAWNEY. I was going to ask the gentleman on what facts he bases his judgment that \$350,000 is the amount that should be appropriated rather than \$300,000.

Mr. SHERLEY. I based my opinion on the fact that the man having this work in charge, who needs no better encomium than the one given him by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY], said that he needed that much, and it would seriously cripple the progress of that work if it were reduced; that this House last year determined that was a fair amount to give, and I have a little more respect for the House than the gentleman. If I had been a member of the Appropriations Committee and the House had formally taken action as it did last year, I would respect the action of the House and consider its accumulated wisdom at least equal to my own.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, I yield to no man in respect for the industry, ability, intelligence, and courage with which the present chairman of the Committee on Appropriations performs the arduous and important duties incident to that position, assisted by the very able Members on either side of this Chamber who compose the balance of that committee. But this is a case in which I find myself compelled to differ with them as to amount to be appropriated. One reason which I have for asking for a larger amount in this appropriation is that for every dollar we appropriate to this service we get \$2 worth of work.

Mr. TAWNEY. One moment now. Will the gentleman permit a question there?

Mr. OLMSTED. Certainly.

Mr. TAWNEY. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that this is in violation of the express law?

Mr. OLMSTED. No; I am not.

Mr. TAWNEY. Then I will cite the law to you, and you will see it.

Mr. OLMSTED. The States appropriate a certain sum of money to help bear the expense of this work, and I am not aware of any law or any constitutional provision which prevents them from so doing any more than there is a provision to keep the State of Pennsylvania from appropriating, as it did in the last session of its legislature, \$250,000 to assist the Government in dredging the channel at Philadelphia.

Mr. TAWNEY. Yet, under the policy of State cooperation inaugurated by the Geological Survey, the money which we appropriate for topographical service is available and is expended only in States that will contribute a like amount, thereby giving it to States that would not otherwise get any part of this appropriation and withholding from States a part of the appropriation that they are entitled to and would otherwise receive, but because of their inability to put up the money and cooperate with the Federal Government they can not do it. Now, this money is paid by the States for the benefit of the Federal Government in the making of a topographical survey of the United States, and the statute says:

Nor shall any Department or any officer of the Government accept voluntary services, or the Government employ personal services in excess of that authorized by law.

There is a clear violation against this cooperative plan of making a geological and a topographical map of the United States. If it is the duty of the Government of the United States to do it, as gentlemen claim, then it is unlawful for the Government of the United States to accept a dollar of this money from any State to aid in making that survey.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman may be extended five minutes.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, I am not entirely familiar with the statute to which the gentleman refers, and, without reading the whole of it, am unwilling to accept his construction. If it can be so construed as to prohibit State aid, it is certainly not enforced, and it ought to be repealed. If there is no other reason why the Government should not avail itself of what assistance it can get in doing this work and keep this work going on than that it may operate to help some water company or street railroad, that argument does not appeal strongly to me. Why, Mr. Chairman, we appropriate millions for improvement of navigable streams and harbors. The very object of the work done by the Government in that direction is to assist the steamboat companies and steamship companies which operate upon them, the railroads that connect with them, and the commerce of the country generally.

Now, one word as to the work of this Survey in cities. It seems to me that it is hardly understood. I will read from the testimony of Mr. Walcott, the Director, himself.

Mr. TAWNEY. On what page?

Mr. OLMSTED. Page 481. I want to read what the Director of the Geological Survey said in his statement before the committee. I have not spoken to the Director nor had any correspondence with him, nor has any employee of the department asked for my influence or my vote upon this or any other provision. The chairman asked him this question:

The CHAIRMAN. Do you make topographic maps of the cities?

Mr. WALCOTT. Only incidentally to the survey of the larger area in the progress of making a general topographic map. In only a few instances we made a special attempt to make a city map very accurate; one was Pittsburg and vicinity, in which the city contributed the additional cost of doing it. Another case was the city of St. Louis, prior to the great exposition there, when it was thought to be desirable to have not only the city, but the surrounding country included in the topographic maps of which St. Louis formed a portion. The city of Louisville recently sent a delegation asking if we would furlough three or four of our men this spring to make a topographic map of the surroundings of Louisville, they to pay all expenses, including their salaries, in order to get a detailed topographic map suitable to base their sewerage system upon. They did not feel that they had the men, or that they could well get the men, that would do that work as well for the city. Of course that is no expense to the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. Were the men furloughed?

Mr. WALCOTT. The men were furloughed, and are now doing the work.

Now, I do not concede that there is anything in the statute which the worthy chairman alluded to which would prevent the furloughing of men employed by the Government and allowing them to work a little while for and at the expense of a State or city, and it is the way I understand that State aid is accomplished.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OLMSTED. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks that his time may be extended for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, in my judgment there is one single item in which the utility of these topographical surveys exceed their entire cost. You never can locate a military camp in the United States without making such a survey, and to have it made specially would cost three times as much as to make it in the way they do now. You can not move an army through the United States or conduct any military operations without such a survey. You can not find the roads or locate the best ground in a State for such purposes. You can not tell where to find the best streams to get an adequate supply of water for the army unless such work as this has been done in advance. The basis of military operations is a survey of this kind, and such surveys can be made much more cheaply in this way, where they get the State to pay half the cost. That is merely one item of the value of these topographical surveys. Their importance in other directions is still greater.

Within the past three years, as I find on page 477 of the hearings, there has been topographical work done in forty-five States of the Union; and so great is the interest of the people in it that the Director says 1,007,280 copies of the atlas sheets have been purchased, and the regular price paid for them has been turned into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I approve this amendment, giving the appropriation for a topographical survey precisely the same amount that the House appropriated for it last year.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the debate upon this amendment, to my mind, tends to show that the Chair was in error in his ruling on the point of order made against this paragraph. The Chair held that the paragraph was in order because it was for the continuance of existing work which would ultimately be completed, and distinguished it from the paragraph for the gauging of streams, because to that there would be no end. The distinction made does not seem to be founded in fact, as the record shows that so far from this work of the topographical survey being completed it requires annually larger and larger appropriations. As the work progresses and large portions of the country are supposed to be thus surveyed, and the amount unsurveyed becomes less and less, one would naturally expect to find the appropriations for this purpose falling off, but quite the contrary is true. They are constantly growing, and the less of the country that remains to be surveyed the larger is the appropriation demanded for the purpose.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman submit to a question?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. PADGETT. In the last naval appropriation bill we authorized the construction of a battle ship that it is estimated will cost \$11,000,000. How much is the entire appropriation, from its inception until now, for the Geological Survey?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I am not able to state what the entire appropriation has been.

Mr. PADGETT. I will ask the gentleman—

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Nor do I care to be turned aside into a discussion of the merits of the naval programme.

Mr. PADGETT. I will ask the gentleman if—

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I dislike to decline to yield. I know the gentleman will admit I always yield, but I can not discuss the naval programme.

It has been asserted here this afternoon that the topographical survey is the basis for the geological survey. That, in a measure, is true, and in view of that fact I want to call attention to the map hanging here in front of the House. Those portions colored in pink have been topographically surveyed; those colored purple have been geologically surveyed. Now, if the topographic survey is to be defended as a preliminary to the geological survey, manifestly we have gone so far with the topographic survey that we could wait for years before the geological survey would catch up with the topographic or preliminary work.

I want to call the attention of the House to the distinctions in these topographic surveys. It appears that they have numerous kinds of maps; one, a single sheet covering a square degree, or about 4,000 miles; another size covering about a thousand miles, and another about 250 miles. Now, those that cover the larger area upon the same size paper used for the smaller, manifestly can not go into great detail. They show the result of a cursory reconnaissance. The map covering a smaller area shows more of detail, and so as they reduce the area covered by the map it means more work, more accurate surveys, more accurate records.

If you will examine this map you will find that in the public

domain of the United States practically nothing has been done except to make this cursory reconnaissance in certain regions recorded on maps covering 4,000 square miles on a sheet of no value except for the most general purposes. But under this system of contribution, which was instituted by this Geological Survey, without any act of Congress to sustain it, they provide for selling these appropriations to whoever will pay the highest price for them. If a State says, "We will give \$50,000," then this Bureau chief, without authority of Congress, diverts the money that would otherwise go to some place else in the United States to that place, in order that he may spend \$100,000 in place of the \$50,000 given him by Congress. What has been the practical operation of this administration? There is not an acre of Massachusetts, of Rhode Island, or of Connecticut that is not surveyed upon the most detailed scale, the maps covering the smallest territory; the money diverted from the people of the interior, diverted from the lands of the United States, in order that it may be concentrated in those places that will pay the most to get it.

[The time of Mr. SMITH of Iowa having expired, by unanimous consent it was extended five minutes.]

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the debate on this paragraph and amendments close in ten minutes, five minutes for the gentleman from Iowa, and five for the gentleman from North Carolina who offered the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] yield to the gentleman from Minnesota to make the motion?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota moves that all debate on the pending paragraph be closed in ten minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. I move to amend by making that twenty.

The question being taken on the motion of Mr. MONDELL, it was rejected.

The motion of Mr. TAWNEY was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I will yield to the gentleman from Kansas, and then I can yield no further, in view of my limited time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa who directs the bureau or its operatives where to make these surveys?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. No one directs them, but the Director, in place of determining where it should go by his unbiased judgment in the interest of the public service, in place of determining whether he will put an equal amount of money in the poorer States not able to contribute as much money as some of the others, diverts the money from the center of the country to New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island until they are complete, and the public domain is unsurveyed.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That accounts for the reason that I have been refused the money for certain surveys that I have applied for in geological parts of the country.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is the reason, because these funds have been diverted; and I for one believe that the amount they asked for a year ago for this purpose, in view of the fact that the topographical survey is far ahead of the geological survey, is sufficient until we shall have an opportunity to pass such legislation as will require this Geological Survey to make a fair and equitable distribution of the money appropriated.

Mr. SMALL. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I have stated I could not yield any further. I simply want to give one illustration of the practical operation of this Survey. I was out at Laurel, Md., last Sunday and I met a gentleman at the hotel there, until recently an agent of the Census Office collecting statistics on manufactures, who asked if the party I was with was a party from the Geological Survey. We told him it was not. He said, "They have been having corps of men out here so frequently that I thought you might be a corps from that body; they have been out here surveying the river and surveying to see what is the best route for a prospective new railroad through the country." That is what the Geological Survey is doing with the topographical map. It is pandering everywhere to local interests to provide means for some local business. It is providing for the measuring of streams to find out what it will pay to give for water power; to find where it is best to build a railroad, so that the company will not have to survey it for itself. It is doing every conceivable kind of work of that character, and the time is coming when some legislation ought to be passed by Congress to distribute this money fairly among all the States. [Applause.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes; I am pretty near through.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman from Iowa has made a right important statement, and if the Geological Survey has been surveying the routes of railroads, and the gentleman has any evidence of that the House ought to have it.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I have given you all the evidence I have, except what is in the hearings.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This was a chance remark by an individual you never saw before?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I never met him before.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Have you any evidence from any other source of the fact?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I have stated all the evidence I have.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If they have been doing that, the country ought to have the evidence, and the House ought to have the evidence.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I have stated all the evidence I have.

Mr. TAWNEY. I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi that if he will examine the hearings he will find that it is conceded by the Director of the Geological Survey that the topographical maps of some of the places heretofore made were made for the purpose of locating and grading street railways.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Topographical maps?

Mr. TAWNEY. That is what I understood the gentleman from Iowa to say, that they were making a topographical map.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If that has been done, it ought to be corrected right away, and somebody in the dominant party ought to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, in the brief time I have I shall not refer to the merits of this topographical survey. That has been stated so concisely and admirably by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] and others, that it is unnecessary to do so. But I do wish to refer to one or two inconsistencies which have developed in this debate. The gentleman who made the point of order against this entire paragraph, and who would strike it out, is the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. GILLET, and I would remind the House that he has had his entire State surveyed by the cooperation of the United States Geological Survey. After his State has enjoyed the benefits of this appropriation for this service, he would, it seems, withdraw it from the remainder of the States and Territories of the Union. The chairman of the committee [Mr. TAWNEY] has put the action of the committee on the plea of economy. His entire appropriation for the present year for the Geological Survey is \$1,484,000. The report of this committee has cut that down \$307,000, or about one-third of the entire appropriation for the current year.

Listen and see in what respect they have cut the current appropriations. They have taken \$50,000 from topographical surveys, \$30,000 from the survey of forest resources, \$25,000 from the report on mineral resources, \$100,000 for gauging streams, which I presume will go out upon the ruling of the Chairman, and \$102,000 in the investigation of fuel resources; so that it makes a total of \$307,000 which the committee has deducted from the appropriations for the current year for the Geological Survey. I take it, then, that it is pertinent to inquire in what respect the committee has followed out its plan of economy, and whether or not it has been consistent. It appears from the report of the committee that the appropriations carried in this bill, not including the amount for the Panama Canal, are \$1,728,000, in round numbers, more than in the appropriations for the current year carried in the sundry civil appropriation bill.

Mr. TAWNEY. And will the gentleman also state at the same time that we carry seventeen millions in this bill for rivers and harbors authorized by the last river and harbor bill, which is six millions more than was carried in the last bill, and that as a matter of fact the total amount appropriated by this bill is five million less than the current appropriation?

Mr. SMALL. Oh, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has had plenty of opportunity to make his speech. I am trying to point out to the House that this plea of economy, which is made by the chairman as a reason for cutting down this amount \$50,000, does not apply to all of the items.

The true reason, I think, is stated by the chairman, when he said that \$300,000 had been previously appropriated, and that by reason of the fact that \$50,000 was given at the last session of Congress he desired it placed back to the old figure of \$300,000. Who made the increase? It was the membership of this House. The committee came in with the same recommendation of \$300,000, and yet by voluntary action of this House, and by a large majority, that appropriation was increased to \$350,000, the same increase which is asked for by this amendment, so that the reason which the chairman gives

for his position is not tenable. There was no lobby, as is alleged, which came into the House last time any more than there is at the present time in favor of these appropriations for this Survey. I doubt if a single Member of this House can be found who will say that he has obtained any information from the Director or any of the officers of the Survey, except by his voluntary application, and that in no instance have they attempted by approaching any Member of the House to do any act inconsistent or which could have been constructed as improper lobbying in favor of any of the items of the appropriation for the Geological Survey. So, gentlemen, I have pointed out all that I can in the limited time at my hand. These are some of the inconsistencies that have been urged against this amendment to this appropriation. I hope that the House, in answer to the demand coming not alone from the South, coming not alone from New England, but from the entire country, a demand for this \$350,000, will respond and that the amendment will pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired, and debate on the paragraph is exhausted.

Mr. DALZELL. I desire to direct the attention of the committee for a few moments from the outside matters that have been discussed to the real question before the committee.

The pending paragraph reads:

For topographical surveys in various portions of the United States, \$300,000, to be immediately available.

Upon a point of order made the Chair has ruled that the proposed appropriation is in order as the continuation of a public work already in progress. An amendment has been offered to increase the amount by \$50,000. It is claimed by the officers of the Geological Survey that the efficient continuation of this public work will be hampered unless the amendment shall be adopted.

Hence I want to call attention to the character of the work, to what has been accomplished, and to what remains to be accomplished.

The reason why so many Representatives are especially interested in this item is because it directly affects their respective States.

The topographical survey is a cooperative work carried on jointly by the United States and the several States contributing thereto. As the Director of the Geological Survey said before the committee, "If the Government puts up a dollar, the State meets it." The work in its character, its results, and its prospects can not better be described than in the paper filed by Mr. Walcott with the committee. It is as follows:

The idea of cooperation in public surveys between the Federal and State governments originated in connection with the plan to make a topographic map of Massachusetts. The cooperative survey of Massachusetts was commenced in 1885 and completed in 1888.

At the time of commencing the cooperative survey of Massachusetts the State of New Jersey was engaged in making a topographic map of its area. Attention being attracted to the Federal cooperation with Massachusetts, arrangements were made whereby the Federal survey took up the work and carried it to completion in 1887. Since that time appropriations have been made by a number of States.

The table following shows the States in which cooperative surveys have been completed or are in progress. The scale of all work completed under cooperation, except that in California, is 1:62,500, and the contour interval is from 10 to 20 feet. In California some areas have been surveyed on the scale of 1:125,000 with 100-foot contours, and some special maps have been made on the large scale of 2 inches to the mile, with contour intervals of 5 feet. In the column "Area mapped" only those areas mapped since the inception of cooperation are enumerated:

Cooperative topographic surveys in various States.

State.	Area.		Total cost to June, 1906.	Appropriated by State to June, 1906.
	Sq. miles.	Sq. miles.		
Alabama	52,250	3,455	\$26,500	\$5,000
California	158,360	2,639	70,000	25,000
Connecticut	5,047	All.	48,555	25,000
Illinois	56,650	1,430	20,000	10,000
Kentucky	40,000	1,359	33,000	16,500
Louisiana	48,720	1,110	7,500	2,500
Maine	33,040	2,814	36,400	18,200
Maryland	12,210	9,884	77,500	32,550
Massachusetts	8,315	All.	107,845	40,000
Michigan	58,915	1,734	18,400	6,700
Mississippi	46,810	196	2,800	1,400
New Jersey	7,815	All.	54,744	19,670
New York	49,170	35,687	490,738	208,100
North Carolina	52,250	4,023	45,027	21,027
Oklahoma	33,030	356	10,000	5,000
Ohio	41,060	15,122	242,800	121,400
Oregon	96,030	864	5,500	2,500
Pennsylvania	45,215	11,080	224,000	112,000
Rhode Island	1,550	All.	9,732	5,000
Texas	265,780	1,620	-----	5,000
West Virginia	24,730	6,964	150,000	75,000
Total	-----	-----	-----	768,497

METHODS OF COOPERATION.

In the establishment and conduct of cooperative surveys certain methods which have been developed through an experience of eighteen years are followed.

The Director is requested by citizens of a State which may be interested in procuring topographic surveys to inform them as to his ability to accept such offers of cooperation as the State may be prepared to make, it being understood that efforts to secure cooperation must originate with the residents of the State. This Survey furnishes such information concerning the details of previous cooperative arrangements as may be sought, and in other ways assists the State officials and legislators to attain the object desired by them. The State legislature usually enacts legislation providing for a cooperative survey to be conducted under the supervision of a State official or commission, who (1) shall have control of the expenditure of the money appropriated; (2) shall make agreements with the United States Geological Survey as to the methods of conducting the work, and (3) shall recommend the order in point of priority in which various portions of the State shall be surveyed.

It is invariably stipulated that the field operations shall be under the supervision of the Director of the Geological Survey. This Survey furnishes expert assistants, who take charge of the work, and who discuss the results for publication or draft the manuscript maps. All details of the work are performed by them under rules and by methods which experience has shown to be the most economical and judicious, and which tend at all times to maintain a uniformity of treatment for the whole of the United States.

The United States Geological Survey accepts the recommendations of the State officials for the employment of such temporary assistants as may prove qualified for the work, thus insuring the employment of residents of the State so far as practicable. The law usually specifies that a sum equal to that appropriated by the State shall be expended in the same time by the United States Geological Survey.

BENEFITS FROM COOPERATION.

The Federal Survey benefits by the great increase in funds available for the extension of its legitimate operations. This Survey is charged with the duty of making a topographic and geologic map of the entire area of the United States, as well as of studying its water resources and reporting on its other economic products. The expense of this work to the Federal Treasury is reduced by the amount appropriated by the various States for cooperative surveys. To date this amounts to \$768,497.

All agreements for cooperation being on the basis of equal expenditure, they necessarily reduce by one-half the cost the Federal Government of conducting its operations. An additional benefit from cooperation is the hastening of the completion of the topographic map, which thus renders it available at an earlier date as a base for the further studies of economic resources, geology, hydrography, and the classification of lands.

From the experience gained certain conditions essential to the success of cooperation have been established. All work which is in part paid for by the Federal Survey and which may be published by it or on its authority must be controlled by the Director. He selects assistants to perform such work, or approves their selection. In its execution the work is subject to the supervision and approval of the appropriate chief of division of the Federal Survey. All agreements for cooperation are drawn in such manner as not to conflict with the organic law of the Survey in regard to collections, furnishing information, or giving expert testimony.

One important point to be considered in all such work is that the general plans and methods of the Federal Survey can not be set aside on account of State cooperation.

At the present time the funds available for cooperation are so limited that its further extension is dependent on increase of appropriations by Congress.

It is against the policy of the Survey to stop work on important areas or subjects in order that cooperation with individual States may be extended. The Director is willing to enter into a cooperative agreement only when the interests of the country as a whole will be benefited.

The appropriations made by the States for cooperative surveys are accepted chiefly for actual field work in which are included the services of temporary employees, who are usually residents of the State, and for the living and traveling expenses of the field force. It may be used in paying office salaries only in so far as it is necessary to equalize the expenses of both parties to the cooperation. Thus the larger part of the amount appropriated by the State is returned to the people thereof.

The appropriation of the Federal Government is devoted chiefly to paying the salaries of the permanent employees, a small portion of it being expended on general administration and a considerable portion on field and office work.

All the assistant surveyors, as levelmen, transitmen, etc., and such helpers as redmen, teamster, and cook, are employed under regulations of the Department of the Interior. In the locality in which the work is being done and under the terms of a signed application and agreement, which they must file when seeking such employment.

It will be observed from the figures given in this statement of Mr. Walcott that there remain a number of States where the work has not yet been entered upon; and it will further be observed that in none of the States has it been completed. Progress has been made in different degrees in different States. It is apparent, therefore, that this public work in progress demands liberal treatment if its progress is to be continued and any hope of its completion indulged in.

Complaint has been made that the Director of the Survey and his associates have been too active in "lobbying," as it is termed, in the interest of large appropriations, and that they have inspired parties to send letters to their Representatives urging their assistance. At the same time the Director has received merited praise, both for his work and for himself, as a faithful and efficient public officer, in which praise I most cheerfully join. For my part, I rather admire the zeal of a public official who is in love with the work of his department and is desirous of imparting that zeal to others. No part of

the appropriation goes into his pocket. His zeal is impersonal and honest, as he believes in the public interest.

Whatever may be the case with others, so far as I am concerned the people of my State needed no inspiration to induce them to address me on the subject, as they had a perfect right to do. In proof of this I desire to submit as part of my remarks the following letters:

Hon. JOHN DALZELL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I just learn that the sundry civil bill as reported makes a very serious cut in the amount asked for topographic survey work by the United States Geological Survey. This is a matter that very seriously affects the interests of Pennsylvania.

The appropriation is very largely used for cooperative work with the various States, the amount allotted to Pennsylvania being \$20,000, the State appropriating an equal amount. Pennsylvania is not an easy State for topographic mapping, yet the results of the work can not but be pleasing to the people of the State.

The United States Geological Survey has not been able to make a larger allotment to Pennsylvania, as the entire appropriation for topographic work has been but \$400,000, and this would not allow of a larger sum to this State even if the legislature would make a larger appropriation for the work on behalf of the State. The proposed reduction of \$30,000 means a very serious reduction in the amount of work that can be done in Pennsylvania, for there is some work under way under the direction of the United States Survey that probably can not be cut, so that the cut for work in Pennsylvania will probably be much greater than the 20 per cent cut made in the bill as reported.

Personally, and on behalf of the commission in charge of the topographic work in Pennsylvania, I would esteem it a great favor to have you do all in your power to have the appropriations for the work of the United States Geological Survey restored to amounts asked for the work. The reduction of these amounts means the very serious loss to the efficiency of the work, the breaking up of the organization, which means a direct loss, and a postponement of the completion of the topographic mapping, which is daily becoming more valuable as the work goes on toward completion.

Can not these appropriations for the United States Geological Survey be restored to the amounts asked by the Secretary of the Interior?

Very truly, yours,

RICHARD R. HICE.

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 4, 1906.

Hon. JOHN DALZELL,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DALZELL: I desire to call your attention to the importance of keeping up the appropriation to the United States Geological Survey at least to what it was last year, and increasing the same, if possible. I do not now have either the time or ability to tell you of the immense economic importance to our country of the work of this department along the various lines of topography, geology, hydrography, testing of fuels and building materials, as well as in other lines of scientific investigation; but, as chairman of the Pennsylvania topographic and geologic commission, I beg to say that some years since I had the honor to introduce a bill in our legislature, which afterwards became a law, authorizing our State to cooperate in this work with the United States Geological Survey. At that time I confess that in our State there was little interest in the subject, but as the work has progressed and the people are learning its real economic and scientific values, the demand for it from every section is increasing so rapidly that it is impossible for us with our present appropriation to meet it. Our commission feel assured that the Pennsylvania legislature will increase its appropriation for this work at the coming session, provided the United States Geological Survey will be in position to similarly increase its apportionment to our State. This it can not do if the amount cut out by your Appropriation Committee is not replaced in the bill. The departments of health, forestry, highways, and military of our State are especially interested in the rapid prosecution of this work. So also is every civil engineer, as well as every citizen or corporation who is interested in the development of our great material resources. I know of no direction in which the expenditure of an equal amount of money has been productive of such permanent benefit to our State. At the head of this department are some of the ablest men the country affords. They are devoting their great abilities unselfishly to this work, and should have the hearty financial support of Congress. As to the actual work so far completed in Pennsylvania, not having access to my office I do not have the data at hand, but have asked H. M. Wilson, esq., to hand it to you. I feel that it is exceedingly important at this juncture that you, if possible, give this matter personal attention.

I beg to remain, very respectfully, yours,

G. W. MCNEES,
*Chairman Pennsylvania Topographic and
Geologic Survey Commission.*

SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING,
THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE COLLEGE,
State College, Pa., June 2, 1906.

Hon. JOHN DALZELL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: After my conversation with you in Washington on the 28th ultimo I had confirmed what before had been rumored, that the items in the sundry civil bill appropriating \$250,000 for the investigation of fuels and \$100,000 for testing structural materials were in danger of being eliminated from the bill, or at least greatly reduced. We believe this would be most unfortunate to the people of Pennsylvania.

The work in fuel testing, which has been done under the general direction of the Geological Survey commission, is recognized by all who have given the matter any attention as being excellent; but should no further appropriation be made and the work necessarily stop, the money which has already been expended would be largely wasted. Although some results have been reached, the value of the work up to this time has been mostly in showing what may be accomplished by further investigation.

When it is remembered that the fuel of the United States by the time it is in the fire box costs the nation a billion and a half of dollars annually, an appropriation of \$250,000 toward experiments looking to fuel economy is certainly a small item. The investigation carried on by the Government would produce results which would be accepted and could be used by all fuel users. Experiments of this character could

be carried on only by large corporations, and if so conducted would, of course, be for their special use and the knowledge would be for them only.

With reference to the item for the investigation of structural materials, the benefits to be derived from the study of these is so great and so far-reaching that it is scarcely necessary to mention them. What is capable of being done in this direction is really not known. The character of structures best adapted to withstand fire or earthquakes is also unknown. The uses to which cement may be profitably put is a comprehensive and unsolved problem. The producers of these materials are not so much interested in the economy of the materials as are the users, and the users consist largely of the people of the United States. It seems, therefore, legitimate that the nation should carry on these investigations.

Knowing your attitude on questions of this kind which are so far-reaching in beneficial results, and the interest you have already shown in this measure, I do not hesitate to write you urging your earnest support in securing the passage of these items.

Yours, respectfully,

LOUIS E. REBER,
Dean School of Engineering.

These letters show the general interest taken in this subject apart from any influences operating from the Department. They are evidence of the real and continued and active interest of those who are familiar with the work of the Survey in the past and are interested in its successful prosecution in the future. I hope that the amendment will prevail.

Mr. MONDELL rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Wyoming rise?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to call the attention of the House to the fact that no Member from the public-land States has been heard on this proposition. It was originally supposed that this survey was primarily for the benefit of those States. I also rise to ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to address the committee for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to address the committee for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I have asked unanimous consent to address the committee on this subject in view of the fact that during the entire discussion the fact seems to have been lost sight of that originally it was intended and expected that these topographical surveys, which are the foundation for geological surveys, should be made of the public lands and largely in the mineral regions, and I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that the map before us indicates that by far the greater portion of these surveys have been made in States that either never had any public lands or where the public lands have long since been disposed of. States that contributed nothing, or long since ceased to contribute, to the Treasury of the United States in the sale of public lands, and that but a small portion of the country west of the one hundredth meridian has been surveyed topographically since the surveys have been executed on the present scale. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] has stated that it costs no more to topographically survey the city of Louisville than a like area out in the country, where the transit men can see for great distances, where from an elevation distances can be triangulated for miles, where mapping is much more simple, and where the surveys made, as in the case of the old Powell surveys in Utah and elsewhere, were on contour intervals of 50 feet, while the contour intervals in the city of Louisville, I assume, are a foot or two.

Mr. SHERLEY. And the additional cost is paid by the city of Louisville.

Mr. MONDELL. And I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that, in my opinion, that is one of the evils which has grown up under this survey, a survey wisely inaugurated, a survey which, in the main, has been economically carried on, a survey which has been of great value, and I do not claim that these surveys should not be made in the city of Louisville, that they should not be made in the city of Boston. I do wish, however, to emphasize the fact that while we have for years heard discussions of this and similar items as though they were for the especial benefit of the West, and for the development of the western region, the mountain region, the public lands, as a matter of fact, the eastern and southern brethren have managed to secure the lion's share. By far the greatest proportion of the expenditure has been made in States that needed it the least, because they were the best able to make their own surveys, as evidenced by the fact that they have been able to contribute a portion of the cost of the work. I believe in these surveys. I do not complain because of their being executed in all portions of the country, but I do believe that the amount which the committee has reported is quite sufficient to carry on the work in all parts and portions of the country with reasonable speed, and I do trust that in future the West, which was originally expected to be the main beneficiary of this class of work, will at

least get a fair proportion of the expenditure. In that region are the public lands which need developing; there are the public mineral lands which should be geologically surveyed and reported upon. I make no complaint in regard to my own State. I think we have been reasonably well treated, but I do think the public domain, as a whole, has not had as large a share in this work as it should. I hope the work will go steadily on, not by fits and starts, but continuously, and I think it is most likely to do so if we do not further increase the appropriation at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the amendment read again.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TAWNEY) there were—ayes 101, noes 54.

Mr. TAWNEY. Tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered.

The Chair appointed Mr. TAWNEY and Mr. SMALL as tellers.

The House again divided; and there were—ayes 101, noes 55.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the preparation of the report of the mineral resources of the United States, which report shall hereafter be published in one octavo volume and as a distinct publication, the number of copies, printing of separate chapters, and mode of distribution of which shall be the same as of the annual report, \$50,000.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to the lectures on economy to which the House has been treated this afternoon. I sympathize with all real economy, and I am under the impression that genuine economy demands that we liberally support the Geological Survey. This is one department of the Government which aids in the production of wealth, while others that gentlemen do not hesitate to support with lavish appropriations are mere consumers. If we were to spend fewer millions on an excessive naval development, which the country does not need, we would have more to spend in promoting industrial growth, which we do need.

I shall address myself to that item in the bill which has to do with a continuance of the fuel-testing plant at St. Louis. I have been more or less familiar with the work of the plant since it was inaugurated, and I believe that the economies in the consumption of coal which they have suggested is worth much more to the country than the total cost of the Geological Survey since it was established.

SOME FACTS IN REGARD TO THE HISTORY OF COAL PRODUCTION IN THE UNITED STATES TO THE CLOSE OF 1905, AND SOME ESTIMATES AS TO THE FUTURE.

It has been estimated by one of the geologists of the Geological Survey that the total original amount of coal contained in the various beds of the United States was 2,200,000,000,000 tons of 2,000 pounds, which is equivalent to about 422 cubic miles of coal. If spread over the entire coal area of the country it would make a bed averaging 6½ feet thick. I have been informed by a member of the Geological Survey that the history of coal mining in the United States shows that during the last half century the entire production of coal has been practically doubled every ten years, and at my request the following table, compiled from official sources, has been prepared. It bears out the previous statement given me. This shows also that up to the close of 1905 the total production in the United States amounted to, say, 5,980,000,000 tons. This does not include any of the coal left in the mines to support the roof or otherwise necessarily wasted. The fact is, the amount wasted is equal to about one-third of the total amount under our present conditions of mining. This production, by decennial periods, is as follows:

Coal production, by decennial periods, to the close of 1905.

	Short tons.
Total production to close of 1865.....	335,865,947
Production for decade 1866-1875.....	419,425,104
Total production to close of 1875.....	755,291,051
Production for decade 1876-1885.....	847,760,319
Total production to close of 1885.....	1,603,051,370
Production for decade 1886-1895.....	1,556,098,641
Total production to close of 1895.....	3,159,150,011
Production for decade 1896-1905.....	2,820,000,000
Total production to close of 1905.....	5,979,150,011

From the foregoing statement I have had prepared an estimate

which shows how this production of coal would continue if the proportionate rate of increase were kept up. It will be observed that there is a decreasing ratio in the decennial increase. In the following statement this ratio has been maintained, so that while, as in the preceding statement, it has been shown that the production for the decade 1876-1885 was something more than the total production to the close of 1875, the production estimated for the final ten-year period in the following table is about 55 per cent of the total production to the beginning of that decade. This statement also shows that if this rate of increase continues the entire supply will be practically exhausted in one hundred and ten years, not including the wasted production heretofore mentioned:

Estimated production by decennial periods for the future.

	Short tons.
Total production to close of 1905.....	5,980,000,000
Production for decade 1906-1915 (90 per cent)---	5,380,000,000
Total production to close of 1915.....	11,360,000,000
Production for decade 1916-1925 (85 per cent)---	9,640,000,000
Total production to close of 1925.....	21,000,000,000
Production for decade 1926-1935 (81 per cent)---	17,000,000,000
Total production to close of 1935.....	38,000,000,000
Production for decade 1936-1945 (77 per cent)---	28,700,000,000
Total production to close of 1945.....	66,700,000,000
Production for decade 1946-1955 (73 per cent)---	48,700,000,000
Total production to close of 1955.....	115,400,000,000
Production for decade 1956-1965 (70 per cent)---	80,000,000,000
Total production to close of 1965.....	196,200,000,000
Production for decade 1966-1975 (67 per cent)---	131,500,000,000
Total production to close of 1975.....	327,700,000,000
Production for decade 1976-1985 (64 per cent)---	209,700,000,000
Total production to close of 1985.....	537,400,000,000
Production for decade 1986-1995 (61 per cent)---	327,800,000,000
Total production to close of 1995.....	865,200,000,000
Production for decade 1996-2005 (58 per cent)---	496,200,000,000
Total production to close of 2005.....	1,351,400,000,000
Production for decade 2006-2015.....	743,300,000,000
Total production to close of 2015.....	2,094,700,000,000

It is, of course, not to be supposed that even this decreasing ratio of increase will be maintained. I have quoted the above figures simply to show the possibilities, not probabilities. In fact, the member of the Survey to whom I am indebted for an estimate of the quantity of coal originally contained within the coal fields of the United States, states that the production may continue to increase to a maximum of about 150,000,000,000 tons per decade (an average of 15,000,000,000 tons annually), and then gradually decrease for possibly another hundred years. Both estimates, however, are startling in the extreme, particularly when it is realized that at the rate of production in 1904 (350,000,000 tons) the coal supply would last for about 5,000 years. If, on the other hand, the present ratio of increase in consumption is continued the supply will be exhausted in one hundred and ten years.

All this suggests the extreme importance of the fuel tests which for two years we have been making at St. Louis. We must find an economic way of using the fuel supply, or some day, sooner or later, we will be face to face with exhaustion of a commodity which, whatever the future may have in store for us, is now essential to the comfort and happiness of the human race.

The fuel tests conducted by scientific experts offer the only ray of hope in the way of an increased supply.

The best efficiency now obtained in the ordinary railway locomotive practice represents only about 5 per cent of the energy stored in coal. That is to say, we have to burn 20 tons of coal in our locomotives to get the power which Providence put into 1 ton.

In the stationary boiler practice we get better results, for we have managed to make available for economic purposes about 20 per cent of the energy of the coal—that is to say, in stationary boilers we only have to use 5 tons of coal to get the energy that is in one.

It has been stated by some of our best engineering authorities that only one-seventh of 1 per cent of the energy of coal is now made useful in our incandescent electric lighting.

Of course these estimates of the total supply of coal in the country may be inaccurate. Other fields of coal, the existence of which is not now suspected, may be found in the future. Those we know of may not be as extensive as we think. But whatever the amount is we can not increase it except by finding more economical methods of consumption.

It is plain that if we could learn how to use all the energy

of coal in locomotives we would, so far as that particular industry is concerned, multiply the coal supply of the country by twenty, and so on in the proper ratio with other industries. The fuel testing done at St. Louis is intended to do just exactly that thing. To an important degree it has already been successful. Take what has been accomplished in the way of an improved method of using lignite, or brown coal, for instance. It has shown to the mechanical and industrial world that a class of fuel which has heretofore been held in contempt is of vast importance. The State of Texas, except in the one arctic-fuel—received the favor of the Lord in a prodigal way. We have no really high-grade coal, such as is found in Pennsylvania and West Virginia, for instance. But we do have a great area of lignite deposits, and enough value has been added to these deposits by the fuel testers at St. Louis to justify every dollar of expense for the maintenance of the Geological Survey since its establishment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the preparation of the report of the mineral resources of the United States, which report shall hereafter be published in one octavo volume and as a distinct publication, the number of copies, printing of separate chapters, and mode of distribution of which shall be the same as of the annual report, \$50,000.

Mr. BONYNGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 76, line 12, strike out the word "fifty" and insert "seventy-five;" so that it will read "seventy-five thousand dollars."

Mr. BONYNGE. Mr. Chairman, in the appropriation bill of last year there was appropriated for this purpose, covered by this item, the sum of \$75,000.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, now right there I want to state that that is not a statement of fact.

Mr. BONYNGE. I submit, Mr. Chairman, it is a statement of fact; and the gentleman, answering a question I propounded to him a short time ago, himself said that it was a fact that \$75,000 was appropriated for this purpose, which included, as I was about to say, an investigation of the black sands, which is included in this item, although it is not specifically mentioned.

Mr. TAWNEY. It is not included, and it was included and appropriated for to the extent of \$25,000 this present year.

Mr. BONYNGE. The item for the preparation of the report on mineral resources, including the investigation of black sands, in the appropriation bill of last year was \$75,000. Later this year, in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, it was necessary for the Appropriations Committee to appropriate another \$25,000 in order to make up the deficiency.

In the hearing before the Appropriations Committee at this session relation to this item, at pages 498-499 of the hearing, the Director of the Geological Survey gave a memorandum as to the cost of preparing the report on mineral resources, and by that memorandum it was shown that the expenses for preparing this document would be in the aggregate \$73,200. He gives the items on page 499. On page 505 of the hearing this year before the Appropriations Committee it was also shown that the expense of preparing this document for 1905 aggregated \$74,504.75.

Now, Mr. Chairman, for more than five years past, as I recall, the sum of \$50,000 has been annually appropriated for this purpose. During that time, Mr. Chairman, the aggregate of our mineral wealth has increased nearly double what it was when \$50,000 was first appropriated for this purpose. It has increased from one billion dollars to nearly one billion and three-quarters, and with that growth in the aggregate of the mineral wealth of the United States the cost of preparing the pamphlet has necessarily increased, and the additional amount of \$25,000 asked for is a paltry sum in comparison with the increased amount contributed by the mineral industry to the wealth of the nation. The evidence before the committee, on the statement of the Director of the Geological Survey, shows that these statistics can not now be gathered together and this work done for less than \$73,000, and that it has cost in the past more than \$50,000.

So I submit, Mr. Chairman, that in asking for this increase we are simply asking for an amount which the testimony before the committee developed was necessary to be appropriated in order that this document might be prepared. It is one of great value. We are appropriating large amounts of money for the development of the agricultural resources of the country and for gathering together information relative to the development of our agricultural resources, publishing farmers' bulletins, and other documents of great value to the farmer. No one finds fault with the appropriations made for those purposes. It is also important that the statistics relative to the development of the mineral wealth of the country should be collected and published for the information of the people.

This is a document of very great value to those interested in the mining industry of this country, and we are merely asking for a paltry increase of \$25,000, in order that this work may be properly carried on. I hope that the committee will adopt the amendment.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to correct a statement which the gentleman made in closing, that this involved an increase of only \$25,000. Such is not the fact. There was \$50,000 appropriated for the report on mineral resources for the fiscal year 1905. When preparing this appropriation for the fiscal year 1906 it was represented that at the Oregon Exposition they could conduct this inquiry into the location of black sands, and investigate their value, with the machinery that would be loaned to them by exhibitors at that exposition.

These facts prompted the committee to recommend an appropriation of \$25,000, which amount was included in the appropriation for report on mineral resources. Now, they came to us at the beginning of this session and said that that \$25,000 was appropriated for that specific purpose, in connection with the \$50,000 appropriated for the Report on Mineral Resources, and that the work could not be completed with that appropriation, that to complete it would require \$25,000 more. We gave them \$25,000 more, and that \$50,000 for the investigation of black sands the Geological Survey now proposes to attach here as a permanent appropriation. For what? Nothing that relates to the development of mineral resources. The development of mineral resources is not involved in this appropriation. It means merely the collection of statistics with reference to the mineral products of the various mines throughout the United States. Why is it so valuable? Who wants this information? Why, Mr. Chairman, this information is collected by the agencies—

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. I should like to ask the gentleman if he has any idea of the great number of tons of paper that are printed on this subject that are never opened or looked at at all.

Mr. TAWNEY. I do not know, but I presume that the Committee on Printing could give the gentleman some information on that subject. Or if any Member of this House would go to the folding room, I presume he would find hundreds and hundreds of books entitled "Mineral Resources" lying there undistributed, containing information as to the products of the mines of the country. This appropriation is to pay for collecting information concerning production. In addition to it there is an appropriation of some \$68,000 for printing the report after the statistics are collected.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman from Minnesota will allow me, my district may be different from others, but I want to say that I always have requests for all the reports on the mineral resources of the United States that I get.

Mr. TAWNEY. I haven't any doubt but that they are of great value to the colleges and institutions of learning and to those especially interested in the growth and development of the mineral resources of the country, but what I want to make clear to the House is the fact that this appropriation does not relate in any way to the development of the mineral resources of the country. This appropriation is for the purpose of collecting statistics. An appropriation of \$50,000 is all that they have ever had for that purpose, and that is what the Committee on Appropriations has recommended.

The appropriation has been \$50,000 since 1900. Prior to that time it was \$30,000, \$20,000, \$18,000, and \$10,000. In 1891 it was only \$10,000. Since that time this Bureau, under these ambitious gentlemen of the Geological Survey, has taken in a number of other scientific gentlemen engaged in this work, and if there is any additional amount needed it is because of their employment. We are giving them as much as they have ever had for this purpose. Now, the \$50,000 which they had in addition to this during the present fiscal year is the \$50,000 appropriated for the investigation of black sand, which was a new subject, and when we appropriated the last \$25,000 we provided that the \$25,000 appropriated should complete this investigation. There is absolutely no necessity for this increase of \$50,000, which is double the amount that has heretofore been appropriated for this service.

Mr. BONYNGE. The gentleman does not mean that we are asking to double the appropriation?

Mr. TAWNEY. I do say that you are proposing to double it.

Mr. BONYNGE. No; we are only adding \$25,000.

Mr. TAWNEY. I now yield to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman a question along the line of my interrogatory some time ago—whether or not the committee went thoroughly into the details in regard to the expenditure under this head, and are

satisfied that the sum provided is sufficient to meet the increased and growing demands of the country?

Mr. TAWNEY. I will say that the committee did go into the matter very thoroughly, so thoroughly that we had a conference with the Director of the Mint and Doctor Day, who has this particular branch of the service of the Geological Survey under his charge.

Mr. MONDELL. This is a very important report, but I do not think we ought to appropriate more than is necessary.

Mr. TAWNEY. You are appropriating as much when you give them \$50,000 as they have ever had for collecting the statistics in the report.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. WILEY of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I wish to correct the statement made by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee as to the investigation of black sand. I have the report of the last investigation, and it is "An investigation of the properties of black sand: A combination of other methods of treatment; to which is appended a list of the localities where they occur and the proper methods of treatment of each separate section of black sand."

Mr. TAWNEY. Let me ask the gentleman—

Mr. WILEY of New Jersey. The gentleman refused to yield to me, and now I will refuse to yield to him. I am entitled to five minutes and I insist on the full use of my time. To stop the appropriation for the Mineral Resources means the loss of much time and the sacrifice of samples awaiting the tests which have been hauled by the railroads free of charge from various points in the far West.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the report provided for by this appropriation is an exceedingly important one. The gentleman suggests that it has no relation to the development of the mineral resources of the country.

Mr. TAWNEY. I say it is not the basis of the mineral development.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman says it is not the basis of the mineral development, and I admit that. This report does, however, aid, in my opinion, to a considerable extent in developing the mineral resources of the country. The publication of this report of the mineral products of the various States and Territories, of the localities in which minerals are found, the extent of the deposits, and other detailed information given in the report is of great value, and does aid, in my opinion, very considerably in the development of the mineral resources of the country. I understand that the gentlemen of the Geological Survey, in the hearings before the committee, insisted that their detailed statement of the estimated expenditure for the preparation of this work stated the very least sum with which the work could be properly prepared under the conditions now existing, and that was, I am told, a trifle less than \$75,000.

Mr. TAWNEY. That detailed expenditure included the black-sand investigation at Portland.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the gentleman from Wyoming will allow me, the gentleman says that included the black-sand investigation. I want to say from my somewhat inadequate knowledge, that one of the most important things the Government is doing is the black-sand investigation.

Mr. MONDELL. That is true; that work is important, and no doubt this report will contain information on the investigation of the black sands that has been made, and in my opinion, taking into consideration the growth of the mineral products of the country, the discovery of new minerals, the opening of new mineral regions and of many new producing mines in widely scattered areas, this appropriation must necessarily increase gradually.

The fact that there has been no increase in the appropriation for five or six years is the best argument for the increase at this time, in view of the very great increase in the mineral production of the country in the last few years.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BONYNGE) there were—ayes 29, noes 47.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase of necessary books for the library, including directories and professional and scientific periodicals needed for statistical purposes, \$2,000.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WATSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that

committee had had under consideration the sundry civil bill and had come to no resolution thereon.

KINGS MOUNTAIN BATTLE GROUND.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 17983) providing for the erection of a monument on Kings Mountain battle ground commemorative of the great victory gained there during the war of the American Revolution on October 7, 1780, by the American forces, with a Senate amendment thereto.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

CLINTON COUNTY, IOWA.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 18330) transferring the county of Clinton, in the State of Iowa, from the northern judicial district of Iowa to the southern judicial district of Iowa, with a Senate amendment thereto.

Mr. DAWSON. I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

BUSINESS BY UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to state that he has requests from a number of Members about matters that ordinarily are passed by unanimous consent—bridge bills. Is it the sense of the House that they be disposed of now?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, it is now 25 minutes after 5 o'clock, and we met this morning at 11. I think that after 5 o'clock is a very bad time for the House to consider matters of unanimous consent. Paradoxical as it may seem, the Speaker, I think, will agree with me that it is easier to pass a bill by unanimous consent than it is by vote of the House, and unanimous consents ought not to come after 5 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet to-morrow at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Wait a moment, Mr. Speaker. I have no objection to its being done, with the understanding that the gentleman from Minnesota will attempt to rise by 5 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi knows very well that in the handling of a bill like the sundry civil bill one can not always fix definitely the time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It was for that reason that I put it that he would try to rise.

Mr. TAWNEY. I shall try.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course if the gentleman tries hard enough he can do it. I understand now this evening that we were in the midst of a little debate on a question, and it was very difficult for the gentleman to cut it short, but I hope that the spirit of that idea will be carried out.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to state that there are many conference reports, as the Chair is informed, ready for action. Of course it is only a friendly understanding. The Chair does not understand that there is a hard-and-fast agreement that the House will adjourn at 5 o'clock.

Mr. OLMSTED. Only that the committee will rise.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that in spirit the gentleman will rise by 5 o'clock. After that, matters will come up before the House in the regular way.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota, and it is so ordered.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted to Mr. AIKEN to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of John F. Lathem (H. R. 8475, Fifty-ninth Congress), no adverse report having been made thereon.

LIGHT-HOUSE ESTABLISHMENT.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report on the bill (H. R. 19432) to authorize additional aids to navigation in the Light-House Establishment, together with a statement of the conferees for printing under the rules.

The SPEAKER. The conference report and statement will be printed under the rule.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 1812. An act for the relief of Lieut. James M. Pickrell, United States Navy, retired—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.
S. 6256. An act to authorize the Lake Schutte Cemetery corporation to convey lands heretofore granted to it—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 5418. An act relinquishing the title of the United States to certain land in the city of Pensacola, Fla., to James Wilkins—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. 3469. An act to extend the provisions of the act of June 27, 1902, entitled "An act to extend the provisions, limitations, and benefits of an act entitled 'An act granting pensions to the survivors of the Indian wars of 1832 to 1842, inclusive, known as the Black Hawk war, Cherokee disturbances, and the Seminole war,'" approved July 27, 1892—to the Committee on Pensions.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following joint resolution:

H. J. R. 172. An act to supply a deficiency in an appropriation for the postal service.

STATEHOOD BILL.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present conference report on the bill (H. R. 12707) entitled "An act to enable the people of Oklahoma and Indian Territory to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; and to enable the people of Arizona and New Mexico to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States," together with a statement of the conference for printing under the rule.

The SPEAKER. The report and statement will be printed under the rule.

Then, on motion of Mr. TAWNEY (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until 11 a. m. to-morrow.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, with a copy of a letter from the Secretary of War, an estimate of appropriation for pay of Philippine scouts—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of John B. Atchison and Clifton E. Atchison, heirs of estate of Jane Elizabeth Rodes, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. PARKER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12869) to revise and amend the United States Statutes relating to the commitment of United States prisoners to reformatories of States or Territories, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4921); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin, from the Committee on Insular Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6243) to amend an act approved March 2, 1903, entitled "An act to establish a standard of value and to provide for a coinage system in the Philippine Islands," reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4923); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LACEY, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10702) to enable the United States to secure the exclusive use and possession of all lands within the present boundaries of the Fort Wingate Military Reservation in the Territory of New Mexico, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4924); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. YOUNG, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16659) to remove the charge of desertion against Tobe Holt, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4922); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following bills were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LITTAUER: A bill (H. R. 20172) to amend the patent laws for designs—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 20173) to authorize Henry T. Henderson and his associates to divert the waters of Little River from the lands of the United States for use of electric-light and power plant—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 20174) to amend chapter 559 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, approved March 3, 1891—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 20175) to authorize the Missouri Central Railroad Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Missouri River near the city of St. Charles, in the State of Missouri—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WELBORN (by request): A bill (H. R. 20176) to authorize the Missouri Central Railroad Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Missouri River near the city of Glasgow, in the State of Missouri—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 20177) granting condemned cannon for war monument at Trenton, N. J.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: A bill (H. R. 20178) in relation to the Washington Market Company—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 20179) to prevent cruelty to animals while in transit by railroad or other means of transportation from one State or Territory or the District of Columbia into or through another State or Territory or the District of Columbia, and repealing sections 4386, 4387, 4388, 4389, and 4390 of the United States Revised Statutes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BEALL of Texas: A bill (H. R. 20180) to provide for the investigation of controversies affecting interstate commerce, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATTERSON of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 20181) to establish an agricultural experiment station in the Second Congressional district of the State of South Carolina—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRIGGS: A bill (H. R. 20182) to place linotypes, composing machines, and their parts on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 175) granting permission for the erection of a bronze statue in Washington, D. C., in honor of Gen. Francis E. Spinner, late Treasurer of the United States—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A resolution (H. Res. 580) authorizing the Committee on Naval Affairs to investigate the action of the Navy Department in certain matters—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A resolution (H. Res. 582) increasing compensation of the special messengers—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. CASSEL: A resolution (H. Res. 583) for the appointment of a clerk to compile the laws, decisions, and practice relating to the contingent fund of the House—to the Committee on Accounts.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 584) relating to the contingent fund of the House—to the Committee on Accounts.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 585) authorizing payment of approved accounts for reporting committee hearings out of the contingent fund of the House—to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 20183) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Way—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROOKS of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 20184) for the relief of Dennis Sexton—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: A bill (H. R. 20185) granting an increase of pension to Joseph T. Woodward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER: A bill (H. R. 20186) for the relief of Benjamin F. Busick—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20187) granting an increase of pension to John J. Duff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 20188) granting an increase of pension to John H. McCain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 20189) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Daniels—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DWIGHT: A bill (H. R. 20190) granting an increase of pension to John W. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 20191) granting an increase of pension to James P. Mowland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASKINS: A bill (H. R. 20192) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Gitchell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HINSHAW: A bill (H. R. 20193) granting an increase of pension to Christopher Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 20194) granting a pension to Mary Shearer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20195) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Martin Preston, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KELIHER: A bill (H. R. 20196) to provide relief for those whose property was damaged by the firing of high-power guns at Forts Heath and Banks, Boston Harbor, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MACON: A bill (H. R. 20197) for the relief of the estate of Q. K. Underwood, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PATTERSON of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 20198) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Maddox—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 20199) granting an increase of pension to Joseph N. Cadieux—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 20200) for the relief of the estate of Phillip Housen, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RYAN: A bill (H. R. 20201) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Airey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 20202) granting an increase of pension to William R. Browne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 20203) granting a pension to Polly H. Daniels—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 20204) granting an increase of pension to Robert Boyd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZENOR: A bill (H. R. 20205) granting an increase of pension to Zane Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES: Petition of Mrs. M. D. Ellis, superintendent National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Washington, D. C., against sale of liquor in Government buildings and National Soldiers' Homes—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of M. P. Hocker, secretary Permanent Committee on Temperance, Steelton, Pa., against liquor selling in Government buildings and National Soldiers' Homes—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. BEALL of Texas: Paper to accompany bill for relief of J. C. Lankford—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of James Pierce—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BIRDSALL: Petitions of H. P. Root, Dover, Iowa, and George W. Myers, Alexandria, Iowa, et al., for a pure-food law and Federal inspection of slaughtering and packing business—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DUNWELL: Petition of Joseph Grosner, New York, favoring admission to this country of an unlimited number of healthy, able-bodied men whose work is needed for upbuilding the country—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of M. P. Hacker and William H. Anderson, against liquor selling in or on all Government premises, National Soldiers' Homes particularly—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Letters and telegrams protesting against passage of eight-hour law from the following cities: Toledo, Ohio; Rome, N. Y.; Columbus, Ohio; Cincinnati, Ohio; Providence, R. I.; New York, N. Y.; San Francisco, Cal.; Rochester, N. Y.; Cleveland, Ohio; Fostoria, Ohio; Grand Rapids, Mich., and Salem, Ohio—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HEDGE: Petitions of R. W. Newell, Wapello, Iowa, Alex. Hamilton, Newport, Iowa, J. L. Williams, Mount Hamilton, Iowa, J. T. Overton, Overton, Iowa, and C. H. Abel, Mediapolis, Iowa, for a pure-food law and Federal-inspection law of meat packing—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Leon Daily, of Columbus Junction, Iowa, in favor of pure-food bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOPKINS: Papers to accompany bill granting a pension to Mary Shearer, blind and dependent daughter of William Shearer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN: Petition of Black Hills District Medical Society, against amendment to pure-food bill favoring manufacturers of proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NORRIS: Petition of Paul C. Phares and L. M. Warner, for an amendment to post-office rules and regulations making legal all paid paper subscriptions—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. PATTERSON of North Carolina: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Sarah Salmon—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PATTERSON of South Carolina: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mary E. Maddox—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee: Petition of many practitioners of dentistry in Nashville, Tenn., against certain clause in bill S. 2355, relative to reorganization of corps of dental surgeons of Medical Department of Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Business Men's Club of Memphis, Tenn., asking retention of marine hospital at Memphis—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Lewis Holt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI: Protest of B. S. Mayer, of Bethlehem, Pa., against passage of eight-hour law—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of railway employees of Leighton, Pa., protesting against adoption of conference report on rate bill prohibiting granting of passes to railway employees and their families—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of club women in convention, asking favorable action on pure-food bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of railway employees of Mauch Chunk, Pa., protesting against adoption of report on rate bill prohibiting granting of passes to railway employees and their families—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: Papers to accompany bill (H. R. 14151) for the relief of William J. Ashley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMYSER: Petition of wage-workers of Chicago, for passage of bill H. R. 18752 (by Mr. PEARRE)—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of E. Z. Hayes, of Warsaw, Ohio, and M. C. Julian & Son, Newcomerstown, Ohio, for amendment to section 14, chapter 180, act of Congress of March 3, 1879, relative to paid newspaper subscriptions, making all of same legal—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.